# THE SECOND PART OF THE DEFENCE OF THE REFORMED CATHOLICKE.

Wherein the Religion eſtabliſhed in our Church of England (for the points here handled) is apparently iuſtified by authoritie of Scripture, & teſtimonie of the ancient church, againſt the vaine cauillations collected by Doctor *Biſhop* Seminary Prieſt, as out of other Popiſh writers, ſo ſpecially out of *Bellarmin*, & publiſhed vnder the name of *The marrow and pith of many large volumes*, for the oppugning thereof.

*By* ROBERT ABBOT *Doctor of Diuinitie.*

Tertul. de præſcript. aduer. hæret.
*Hæreſes de quorundam infirmitatibus habent quod valent, nihil valentes ſi in benè valentem fidem incurrant.*

*LONDINI*,
Impenſis Thomæ Adams.
1611.

# THE SECOND PART OF THE DEFENCE OF THE REFORMED CATHOLICK.



# TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTIE MONARCH, MY MOST DREAD and Soueraigne Lord, IAMES by the grace of *God King of great Britaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the faith.*



MOST puiſſant and renowmed King, albeit my qualitie & gifts are of meaner ſort and worth, then that I ſhould thereupon preſume thus often to ſolicite your Maieſties acceptation of my foretimely and vndigeſted fruits: yet ſith this buſines was by your Maieſties appointment firſt commaunded, and one part thereof is already become ſacred vnto you, the remainder could not in duty be recommended to any other then to the ſame moſt benigne and foſterous aſpect of your Royall Grace. In the former part I haue indeuored to cleare thoſe miſts and clouds which *Doctor Biſhops* maleuolent breath, out of the foggie vapours of their Romiſh filthie lakes, had blowne amongſt vs in his Epiſtle Dedicatorie to your Highneſſe, whereinto hee had contriued in a generality very many malicious and blind cauils, whereby hee would perſwade your Maieſtie, that the Religion by your

lawes eſtabliſhed is not conſonant to the auncient and firſt approued truth. In this latter part I haue labored the examination and confutation of his whole booke, wherein as he hath taken vpon him more particularly to oppugne the doctrine of our Church in diuers and ſundrie points which are queſtioned betwixt vs, ſo I haue ſtudied according to the talent which God hath giuen me, to make it plainly appeare in the ſame points that the cauſe which he maintaineth hath very ſlender and weake ſupport; that his fortifications of defence are but earth and clay, and his offenſiue weapons but as ſtrawes and ruſhes; and that he had more care to write a booke, then conſcience to weigh the force and truth of that he wrote. Which that it may not be imputed to any inabilitie of his, but to the badnes of the cauſe it ſelfe, he himſelfe profeſſeth that he giueth to his Reader therein [a] *the marrow and pith of many large volumes*, hauing indeed tranſcribed the greateſt part thereof out of *Bellarmines* diſputations, who is now become their common oracle, and the cheef fountaine whereat they al draw. Which may well be wondered at in Doctor *Biſhop*, that he being a ſecular Prieſt, and with the reſt lately caried with that importunate fury againſt the Ieſuites, & hauing been in that cauſe a principall vndertaker aboue the reſt, ſhould notwithſtanding now be content to grace them ſo farre as to furniſh himſelfe out of their armorie to fight againſt vs. But it hath wel enough appeared, that their quarel was but to ſerue a turne, wherin failing of their purpoſe, albeit they haue diſcouered the Ieſuites to be ſo wholly compoſed of fraud and villanie, as ſhould iuſtly cauſe all men to ſhunne & deteſt them, yet they haue yeelded to be gathered with them againe to the feathering of one wing; and though haply they be no otherwiſe tied together but like [b] *Samſons foxes, taile to taile*, their rancor inwardly continuing ſuch as

*Preface to the Reader.*

b *Iudg* 15. 4.

that

that they can hardly one with good countenãce behold the other, yet they agree together to carrie fire betwixt them to burne and conſume the heritage of the Lord. Which fire notwithſtanding we hope by the mercie of God, through your Maieſties religious and godly care, ſhall bee but as the fire of gun-powder againſt the wind, returning vpon the faces of them by whom it was kindled. For although the endeuours of theſe malignant ſpirits ſeeme apparently to tend to the detrimẽt and danger of the Church of Chriſt, yet that God who in the beginning [c] *commanded the light to ſhine out of darkneſſe*, and when he had made all things *very good*, and nothing but good, yet gaue way to ſinne and euill, thãt thereout he might draw ſome further good, the ſame God euen now turneth to the good of many, that which they intend for euill, it coming hereby to paſſe that the Scriptures are more diligently ſearched, the truth more inſtantly preached and defended, the Paſtors of the Lords flocke occaſioned more carefully to ſtand vpon their watch, the deſires of many people inkindled to find certaine reſolution of the things which are ſo greatly queſtioned; and though ſome fal away, who being but [d] *chaffe of light beleefe*, haue but wanted winde to blow them out of the floore, yet many more by the diſplaying and laying open of the trecheries and deceits of ſuch impoſtors are confirmed in the faith, and do learne the more deeply to deteſt the myſtery of iniquitie, whileſt they ſee the poyſoned and deadly fruites that grow out of that ground. Which ſince they haue bene growne to ſo full and perfect ripeneſſe, could not but haue theire time to fall, and the fall thereof hauing bene hitherto ſo happily begunne, we hope ſhall vnder your Maieſties gouernement much more proſperouſly ſucceed, and that God wil go forward to ſhake off [e] *the bitter & cruell grapes of the vine of Sodome*, that men may no longer gather therof to their owne de-

[c] 2. Cor. 4. 6.

[d] Tertull. de præſcr. Auolent quantum volent paleæ leuis fidei, &c.

[e] Deut. 32. 32, 33.

deſtruction. In the meane time your Maieſty hath ſeene and
f Apoc. 12. 7. must expect yet further to ſee f *the dragon and his angels fighting*
g ver. 15. *against Michael and his Angels, and* g *out of his mouth* as it were out of a brimſtone lake, *caſting out* malice & ſlander as *flouds of water, to drowne the woman and her ſeed*, and ſo much the more enraged, becauſe he conceiueth in likelihood h *that*
h ver. 12. *he hath but a ſhort time*, and that the day is at hand which the
i Ier. 51. 6. 11. Lord hath promiſed which ſhall i *bring vpon Babel the vengeance of the Lord & the vengeance of his tẽple.* The Lord make good his word; the Lord haſten his work, that we may ſee it that that k *purple harlot* firſt founded in bloud and paricide,
k Apoc. 17. 4. and hauing ſince by an vnquenchable thirſting after bloud
l Ibid. 18. 24 made her ſelf the ſlaughterhouſe l *of the Saints and Martyrs of Chriſt*, may of her owne children drinke bloud her belly ful,
m ver. 20. that m *the heauens may reioice and the holy Apoſtles & Prophets*, ſeeing the iudgement of God vpon her, *caſting her with violence into the ſea*, neuer to riſe againe. And you, moſt noble King, in whom God hath turned the period of time which threatned alteration & danger to our ſtate & gouernment, to the further ſtrength and eſtabliſhment thereof, and hath lifted your throne far aboue the thrones of your royal Progenitors, and hath made you in a maner the ballance of the Chriſtian world, conſider that it is vndoubtedly for ſome great work that in his prouidence he hath ſo diſpoſed it, and thereto apply thoſe ſingular ornaments and endowments of the mind, wherein you excell all that haue bene before you. God hath made your Highnes able to eſpie and diſcerne the conicatching deuices of thoſe baſtard Catholik ſeducers, & we aſſure our ſelues, that in your ſelf & in your royal poſteritie it ſhal be found, to the great aduancement of the faith and Kingdome of Ieſus Chriſt. Wherein that our hope may not be fruſtrate, we moſt humbly beſeech almighty God to put into your Maieſties heart not to be too ſecure of them

who

who account it a martyrdome to die for the murthering of Christian Princes, and in the shedding of your sacred bloud would think themselues to haue gained the one half of their desires, content perhaps by instructions for a while to temporize, and to make shew of meaning no harme, till the memory of thir late villany being somewhat ouerblowne, they may be the lesse suspected, but hauing already giuen to vnderstand what your Maiestie shall looke for at their hands if opportunity should secód their designes. The Lord auert and turne that iudgment from vs, *and* [n] *bind your Maesties soule in the bundle of life with the Lord your God*, that your eies may long behold that noble Impe of grace, the branch of our hope, together with the other branches of your royall line, growing before the Lord to the further dismay and terror of your enimies, and the greater securitie and assurance of the church of Christ. As for the seruice which according to your Maesties commandement I haue here performed, albeit it be far from that perfection which the weight of the cause requireth, yet I doubt not but it is sufficient to shew on whether part the truth is to be found, and to iustifie the proceedings of your Maiesty against the cauillations of wilfull men, desperatly shutting their owne eyes, that the light of the Gospel may not shine vnto them. Whatsoeuer it is, it most humbly craueth your Maesties acceptance and royall protection and fauor, whereto with all loyall duty I recommend it and your Highnesse selfe to the protection of the most high God, whose cause it is that is defended thereby.

[n] 1. Sam. 25. 29.

*Your Maesties most humble*
*and dutifull subiect*

ROB. ABBOT.

# TO THE CHRISTIAN READER.



*Gentle Reader, thou wilt I hope impute it in ſome part to the condition of the time, that I giue thee this anſwer not altogether ſo well featured and ſhaped as thou haply wouldſt deſire it. Though it be a fruite that may ſeeme to haue bene long in growing, yet as the caſe ſtandeth with me, the length of time hath but ſerued to bring it to his greatneſſe, and therefore howſoeuer it commeth forth with defiance to the aduerſaries, yet I confeſſe it ſeemeth to me not ſo throughly digeſted and ſeaſoned as I would haue wiſhed it, to content thee. In this defence of Gods truth, the things that are ſpecially to be reſpected againſt the importunitie and aduantage of our aduerſaries, are ſtrength and expedition. I haue had care, as the matter would permit, to ſatiſfie thee in both theſe reſpects; and let my care herein obtain pardon of thee, if I ſeem vnto thee to faile in ſome complements otherwiſe. If thou thinke this my anſwer needleſſe becauſe another man hath already taken paines therein, thou muſt remember that no mans priuate preuention could yeeld mee diſpenſation to bee free from doing that which publike authoritie required of mee. I doubt not but in the reading of either, it ſhall appear vnto thee what ſpirit it is wherewith theſe Romiſh factors are led in their oppoſition againſt vs; and that it is not truth and*

*ſauing*

*ſauing of ſoules wherto they bend themſelues, but onely the vp-holding of their faction; whether by truth or falſhood, by right or wrong, it skilleth not, ſo that that may be performed. That thou mayſt the better ſee and iudge of all, I haue inſerted the whole text of Doctor* Biſhops *booke, altogether condemning that falſhood and guile which he hath vſed towards M.* Perkins, *and they al vſe in their pretence and ſhew of anſwering our books, in that they neuer ſet downe the copie of that to which they anſwer. Which policy ſerueth them to blind the Reader, and to gaine libertie to themſelues to conceale and diſſemble what they liſt, to peruert, to vilifie, to falſifie, and by abſurd imputations to caluminate without being controlled. As our fidelitie and good conſcience of the cauſe which we handle, manifeſtly appeareth in that we neuer forbeare to publiſh our aduerſaries bookes to the world, when we haue adioyned an anſwer to them; ſo their guilt and guile is manifeſt by the contrary, for that they feare to put forth our bookes with their anſwers, as doubting leſt the bookes being at hand ſhould bewray and ſhew the vnſufficiencie of the anſwers. As for Maſter* Perkins *booke, being loth too much to increaſe the greatneſſe of the volume, I haue forborne to put it in, the rather for that the ſubſtance thereof for the moſt part may appeare by that that Maſter* Biſhop *hath ſet downe, and where he faulteth, I haue taken occaſion in my anſwer to declare, if not the words yet the ſumme and effect of it, the booke it ſelfe alſo being eaſily had by any that is deſirous more exactly to compare them. The authors conceit for the forme and maner of that work was greatly to be approued; and where as it hath had the liking of very many for the briefe and plaine deliuery of our controuerſiall grounds, they ſhall ſee now that it was not without cauſe that they caried ſo good opinion of it, inaſmuch as the malice of an enemie out of their* many large volumes *can find ſo little matter of waight and ſubſtance to ſay againſt it. I doubt not but it had*

*had beene well that in some places he had giuen it some better strength, but it is to be considered, that as the midwife iudgeth better of the birth then the mother that trauelleth with it, and in gaming, the stander by sometimes seeth more then he that playeth, so it is in writing of bookes, that the Reader and examiner seeth sometimes a defect, where the busied and intangled minde of the writer obserued none: and therefore of welwillers and men indifferent, it is to be expected that that which is somewhat vnperfectly deliuered in one place, be no impeachment of that which is sufficiently fenced and fortified in another. Thou shalt finde it (gentle Reader) to haue beene so written, as that Master* Bishop *is faine to vse verie shamefull and miserable shifts to giue shew of answer to it. Do thou learne hereby to loue the truth, which thus triumpheth in the aduersaries owne campe, and euen in their owne bookes insulteth ouer them, whilest either perforce they subscribe it, or shew themselues so exceedingly distressed to resist or stand against it. Take no offence whosoeuer thou art at the continuance of this fight, because the order must stand which God set downe in the beginning betwixt the Woman and the Serpent,* [a] I wil put enmitie betwixt her and thee, betwixt her seede and thy seede: *and therefore there shall neuer want* [b] absurd or vnreasonable men, [*] hauing their consciences seared with a hote Iron, *with whom no euidence of truth shall preuaile to make them desist from oppugning the seede that is contrarie to them. The beginning of which absurditie is to be seene in wicked* Cain *towards his brother* Abel, *whom the voice of God personally speaking to him could not diuert from that malice whereby he had intended the destruction of his brother. The succession whereof we may behold in the Scribes and Pharisees, and Elders of the Iewes, whom neither the innocencie of the life of Christ, neither the authoritie of his doctrine, neither*

a Gen.3.15.

b 2.Thess.3.2.

* 1.Tim.4.2.

*ther the glory of his miracles, nor any euidence of the hand of God working with him, could any way moue, but that they were ſtill cauilling and quarelling againſt him, ſtill accuſing and condemning him, and neuer ceaſing euen againſt their owne conſciences to fight againſt him. What maruell is it then that the voice of God ſpeaking to vs in the ſcriptures, and teſtifying what the faith and religion is that we are to yeld vnto him, doth not end the quarell and appeaſe the fury of our aduerſaries againſt vs, but that in a mad conceit of themſelues and of their Church, they go on ſtill to make of religion what they liſt, and with impudent faces labour to perſwade men, that howſoeuer in plaine wordes the Scripture ſeeme to make for vs, yet in meaning they are againſt vs? And ſurely incredible it were, but that we ſee it, that men hauing vſe of wit and will, ſhould dare in that ſort as they do to mocke and delude the word of God. At their pleaſure they bring in their abhominations into the Church, and when the Scriptures are alledged againſt them, they tell vs by lame diſtinctions which ſtand one legge in the ſcriptures, the other quite beſide, that the Scriptures mean thus or thus, but in no ſort touch that which is done by them, though the verie letter of the text do apparently contradict them. As if the adulterer ſhould ſay, that the Scripture condemneth not his adulterie with a Chriſtian woman, but onely that which is with Infidels and Pagans; or the drunkard ſhould alledge that it meaneth nothing of his drunkenneſſe, but onely of the drunkenneſſe of them who haue not wherewith to maintaine their drinking. How many diſtinctions haue they, whereof there is no greater reaſon to be giuen then may be giuen of theſe anſwers? Now what hereſie, what idolatrie, what damnable fancies haue there euer beene in the world, which may not finde meanes for their defence if this licencious kinde of diſtinctions and deuices may take place? If theſe mockeries be deemed intolerable in the laws of men, what impiety,*

*what*

*what wickednesse is it thus to dally with and to mocke the word of God? But the light of the scripture doth plainly discouer the vanitie of these shifts, and that is the cause why they hate and shun the scriptures as the theefe doth the gallowes, and the Beare the stake. What a worke do they make, how many deuices do they vse, how readie are they to apprehend euery pretence, to discourage the people from medling with the scriptures, and to breede in them an vncertaintie and doubt of resting their faith there? Bnt there is no cause for thee to be moued at such bugs and scar-crowes, wherewith these malignant aduersaries seeke to fright thee out of the garden of Iesus Christ, desiring to haue thee rather to continue vpon their stinking dunghils, then to gather the sweete and delightsome flowers that yeeld the sauour of life vnto eternall life. Assure thy selfe, that the most absolute assurance of truth is in the voice of truth itselfe, and thou mayst be secure, that howsoeuer men may speake partially, and may deceiue thee, yet God who speaketh to thee in the Scriptures, which the aduersary himselfe dareth not denie; will neuer deceiue thee. They pretend great difficulties and obscurities in the holy Scriptures: but is it a reason for thee to forbeare to drinke and to wash thy selfe in the shallow places of the riuers of God, because there are also gulfes and depths, the bottome whereof thou art not able to search or sound?*[c] In those things which are manifest in the Scriptures, *saith Saint* Austine, [d] In which are contained or found all things that belong to faith and behauiour of life, God speaketh as a familiar friend, without glosing or guile to the hart both of the learned &vnlearned; [e] not that a few, *saith* Hierome, but that all may vnderstand, the Scripture being [f] a riuer, *saith* Gregorie, wherein both the lamb may wade and the Elephant may swimme; [g] the doctrine thereof

c Augusᵗ. epiſ. 3. In ijs quæ aperta ſunt tanquam familiaris amicus ſine fuco loquitur ad cor indoctorum atque doctorum.

d Idē de doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 9. In ijs quæ apertè posita ſunt in Scripturis inueniūtur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moreſq; viuendi.

e Hieron. in Pſal. 86. Non vt pauci intelligerent, ſed vt omnes.

f Gregor. ad Leand. de expoſit. lib. Iob. Fluuius in quo agnus ambulet & Elephas natet.

g Auguſt de vtil cred ca 6. Planè ita modificata vt nemo inde haurire nō poſſit quod ſibi ſatis eſt, ſi modo ad hauriendum deuotè ac pie vt vera religio poſcit accedat.

being

being so tempered, *saith Saint* Austin *againe*, as that there is no man but may draw from thence that that is sufficient for him, so that he come to draw with deuotion and piety, as true religion requireth he should do. *When they then seeke to barre thee from the vse of this heauenly light, what canst thou conceiue but that they are the agents and factors of the Prince of darknesse?* The[h] Sepia *or* Cuttle-fish, Tertullian *saith, when he is in danger to be taken, casteth about him a blacke inkie matter, wherwith he darkeneth the water that the fisherman cannot see him. What is the reason why those men in that sort seeke to compasse themselues about with the blacke and dark clouds of ignorance of the scriptures, but that their own consciences tel them that their deuotions must needs be deserued to be superstitious & damnable if they come to be viewed and surueyed by the light thereof? Now albeit this be the true light* which maketh all[i] things manifest, *and the only sure foundation whereupon we can rest our faith (for what is it what the whole world saith if God say not the same?) yet against the importunity of the aduersarie, and for thy better satisfaction, thou shalt see our assertions & expositions throughly munited and fenced with the acknowledgment of the auncient Church. Wherein although we cannot but say, that by the Fathers and Bishop of those times, many things were conceiued and deliuered amisse (and are not our aduersaries forced, will they, nill they, to confesse the same?) yet God hath so prouided, that his truth* ex abundanti *is iustified by them, and no antiquity or authoritie of humane error hath so defaced it, but that still the track thereof euen by the who sometimes haue deemed somewhat against it, is plainly to be discerned. Yea in sundry articles of our faith the whole streame of antiquitie runeth so oppositely & directly against the doctrine and practise of the Roman church that now is, as that we may woder at their extreme impudency & wilfulnes, who against so cleare & euident testimony*

[h] Tertul. contra Marcion.

[i] Ephes. 5. 13.

do

*doe still persist in the maintenance thereof. Which, in some part thou shalt see in the treatise here following, and shalt vnderstand according to the occasiō here offred, that howsoeuer they cry with wide mouthes,* The fathers, the fathers, *yet their crie is greater then their strength, and that the Fathers haue not left vs vnfurnished either of armour to defend our selues, or of weapons to conquer them. And the more to secure thee hereof, I haue set down the testimonies of the Fathers for the most part in their owne words, either in Latine or translated into Latine, or in the Greeke tongue sometimes where I had the copy at hand, and saw the Latine translation not fitly to expresse the Greeke. I haue had a sincere and faithfull care to deale vprightly herein, and not to trouble thee with impertinent allegations, but onely such as are pregnant and cleare to that purpose for which they are alledged. That God (by whose prouidence this seruice hath befallen vnto mee) make the same profitable both to thee and mee, and grant vs by writing and reading to encrease in the light and assurance of his truth that we may more and more see and discerne the frauds of these Mountbanks and iuggling Sophisters, who by insolent ostentation of words, and casting of false and deceitfull colours, take vpon them to be able to charme the world, and by their wits to iuggle all other men beside their wits, treading vnder foote the word of God, pretending the fathers names, and betraying the faith of the fathers, subiecting all religion to their owne fancie, and saying after the manner of wicked men,* [k] With our tongs we will preuaile, we are they that ought to speake, who is Lord ouer vs? *And thou, O mercifull Father, who onely art the refuge and dwelling place of thy poore and maligned Church,* [l] stablish *for thy names sake* the thing that thou hast wrought in vs, *goe forward with the worke which thou hast so graciously begun, to dissolue the captiuity of Babylon, and to free the remnant of thy Church from the yoke of the slauery and bon-*

[k] Psal. 12. 4.

[l] Psal. 68. 18.

dage

*dage of Antichriſt, that all ſtumbling blocks of Popiſh prophanations and idolatries being remoued, there may be a way prepared for the returne of the forlorne ſeede of* Abraham *into the ſociety of thy people, that thenceforth we may expect and looke for the comming of thy Sonne Ieſus Chriſt, to make an end of theſe euill daies, and to gather vs euerlaſtingly to that hope which in him thou haſt ſet before vs.* [m] Amen, Lord.

Come Lord Ieſus, come quickly.

[m] Apoc. 22. 20.



*The speciall Contents of this Booke.*


THat the Church of Rome maketh Christ in effect no Christ. pag.14.&c. That Rome is Babylon, and the Pope Antichrist. pag.39. Of Free-will. Chap. 1. pag.86.

Of originall sinne after Baptisme. Chap. 2. pag. 168.

Of the certaintie of Saluation. Chap. 3. pag. 255.

Of Iustification. Chap. 4. pa. 379. in which are handled these points:

1. That righteousnesse before God is imputed, not inherent. pag. 387.
2. What manner of faith it is whereby we are iustified. p. 434.
3. That faith onely doth iustifie. pag. 468.
4. How we affirme it vnpossible to keep Gods commandements. pag. 550.
5. That our good workes are not free from staine of sin. p. 573.
6. That true faith cannot be without charitie & good works. pag. 605.

Of Merits. Chap. 5. pag. 629.

Of Satisfaction. Chap. 6. pag. 729.

Of Traditions. Chap. 7. pag. 839.

Of vowes, and namely of the Monkish vowes of chastitie, pouertie and obedience. Chap 8 pag. 992.

Of images. Chap. 9. pag. 1105.


THE

# THE PREFACE TO THE READER,

By Doctor Bishop.



*Gentle Reader, I meane not heere to entertaine thee with many words: the principall cause that moued me to write, was the honour and glorie of God in defence of his sacred verity; then the imployng of his talent bestowed vpon me: as well to fortifie the weker sort of Catholiks in their faith as to call backe and leade others (who wander vp and downe like to lost sheepe, after their owne fancie) into the right waie.*

*I tooke in hand particularly the confutation of this booke, not only for that I was thereunto requested by a friend of good intelligence and iudgement, who thought it very expedient: but also because perusing of it, I found it penned more scholler like then the Protestants vse to doe ordinarily: For first, the points in controuersie are set down distinctly, & for the most part truly. Afterward in confirmation of their opinion, the chief arguments are produced frō both Scriptures, Fathers & reason: Which are not vulgar, but culled out of their Rabbins,* Luther, Peter Martyr, Caluin, Kemnitius, *& such like, though he name them not. Lastly, he placeth some obiections, made in fauor of the Catholik doctrine, & answereth to them as well as he could. And (which I speake to his commendation) doth perform all this very briefly & clearely. So that (to speake my opinion freely) I haue not seene any booke of like quantity, published by a Protestāt, to contain either more matter, or deliuered in better method. And consequently more apt to deceiue the simple: especially considering, that he withal counterfeiteth to come as neere vnto the Romane Church as his tender conscience will permit him, whereas indeed hee walketh as wide from it, as any other noueller of this age.*

*Wherefore I esteemed my spare time best imploied about the discouering*

*ring of it, beeing (as it were) an abridgement of the principall controuersies of these times, and do endeuour after the same Scholasticall manner, without all superfluitie of words, no lesse to maintaine and defend the Catholike partie, then to confute all such reasons as are by* M. Perkins *alledged for the contrarie.*

*Read this short treatise (good Christian) diligentlie, for thou shalt finde in it the marrow and pith of many large volumes, contracted and drawne into a narrow roome. And reade it ouer as it becommeth a good Christian, with a desire to finde out, and to follow the truth, because it concerneth thy eternall saluation: and then iudge without partialitie, whether Religion hath better grounds in Gods word, more euident testimony from the purest antiquitie, and is more conformable vnto all godlinesse, good life, and vpright dealing (the infallible markes of the best Religion) and speedily embrace that. Before I end this short preface, I must intreate thy patience to beare with the faults in printing, which are too too many, but not so much to be blamed if it bee courteously considered, that it was printed farre from the Author with a Dutch Composer, and ouerseene by an vnskilfull Corrector: the greatest of them shall be amended in the end of the booke.*

*Before the printing of this part was finished, I heard that* M Perkins *was dead. I am sorie that it commeth forth too late to do him any good. Yet his worke liuing to poison others, a preseruatiue against it, is neuer the lesse necessary.*

## R. Abbot.

IF you had respected the glorie of God, M. *Bishop*, it should haue appeared by your respect to yeeld soueraigne honor and authoritie to the word of God. God is in heauen, and wee are vpon the earth: we haue no knowledge of him, no aquaintance or dealing with him but by his word. Therein we seeke him, and find him; therein he speaketh vnto vs, and thereout we learne to speake to him. If we haue the word of God, God is present with vs; if we be without the word of God, God himselfe is absent from vs. Therefore by our honour and obedience to the word of God, it must appeare, that we truly and sincerely intend and seeke for the glory of God. Hereby it appeareth that you, M. *Bishop*, in this your booke, haue not sought for the glorie of God, but rather to glorifie [a] *your Lord God the Pope*, as your Glosse of the Canon law most blasphemously

[a] *Extrauag: Ioan. 12: Cui inter in glossa: Credere dominum Deum nostrum Papam sic non potuisse statuere, & ei hereticum censetur:*

mouſly hath ſtiled him. You haue in this worke of yours vſed all manner of vntruth and falſhood, to vphold and iuſtifie his wicked proceedings againſt the word of God. Whatſoeuer God hath taught vs, whatſoeuer Chriſt and his Apoſtles haue deliuered, all is nothing if your Lord God the Pope, and your maſter *Bellarmine* his procter generall, do ſay the contrarie. Howſoeuer ſimplie and plainly they ſpeake, yet they meane not as they ſpeake, if the Pope and *Bellarmine* will tell you another meaning. As for your *talent*, we take it to be greater in your owne opinion and the opinion of your fellowes, then it is indeed. But whatſoeuer it is, you haue abuſed it to the wrong of him that gaue it, not to edificatiō, but to deſtruction, not to fortifie any in the faith, but to nouriſh and harden them that depend vpon you, in error and misbeleefe; not to leade any into the right way, but to intice men to [b] *crooked waies and leud paths*, which [c] *go downe to the chambers of death*, and the end whereof is confuſion and ſhame; not to withdraw men from fancies, but to draw them to other fancies, from fancies in conuerſatiō, to fancies in religion; that ſo beeing fed wholy with fancies, they may periſh in the end for want of true food. And indeed men that wander in fancies, are the ſubiect for your malice & trechery to worke vpon. Many that liue in the opportunitie of the knowledge of Chriſt, yet neglect and deſpiſe the ſame. The light ſhineth into their eies, and they regard it not: God offereth himſelfe vnto them, and they ſay in their hearts, we haue no delight nor pleaſure in thee. Therefore beeing empty and void of truth, they lie open to be filled with error and lies; & hauing vnthankfully withholden themſelues from God, God by iuſt iudgement giueth them ouer to the hands of impoſtors and deceiuers, that it may be verified which the Apoſtle ſaith, [d] *Becauſe they receiued not the loue of the truth that they might be ſaued, therefore God ſhall ſend them ſtrong deluſion that they may beleeue lies, that they may bee damned which beleeued not the truth, but tooke pleaſure in vnrighteouſneſſe.*

[b] Prou. 2. 15.
[c] Ch. 7. 27.
[d] 2. Theſſ. 2. 10.

Your friend of good intelligence and iudgement, that *thought it very expedient* that you ſhould take in hand the confutation of M. *Perkins* booke, ſpake thereof haply as *Caiphas* did of the death of Chriſt, meaning it one way which was to fall out another way. I doubt not but it wil fall out to haue been *very expedient* which you haue done, becauſe you giue hereby occaſion of diſcouering your

false doctrine, & of iustifying the truth of Christ, which *M. Perkins* was carefull to maintaine. I doubt not but many by this occasion will take knowledge of your corrupt and trecherous dealing, your patching and shifting, your cosening and deluding of men, & will discerne the weaknes and absurdity of that bad cause, which with glorious and goodly words you labour so highly to aduance.

As for your commendation of *M. Perkins* booke, it is but the imitation of some vaine-glorious captaines, who to grace their own victories, do set out to the vttermost the aduersaries power & prowesse, thinking their glory to be the greater, by how much the greter men shall conceiue the might and valour of them to haue bene whom they haue ouercome. You dreamed of a victorie heere, and you thought it to be much for your commendation, that your aduersary should be deemed of as great strength as any is to be found amongst vs But we wold haue you to vnderstand, that the Church of England neuer tooke *M. Perkins* booke to be a warriour in compleate harnesse, or a chalenger for the field, but onely as a captaine training his souldiers at home, where he wanteth much of that munition and defence wherewith he should endure the brunt of battell. He wrote it very scholerlike indeed, for an introduction onely to the true vnderstanding and iudgement of the controuersies betwixt vs and you, but knew well, that it wanted much that might haue been added, to giue it ful and perfect strength. You haue taken hereof some aduantage, as you conceiue, and yet how pittifully are you distressed many times both to vphold that which he obiecteth for you, and to answere that which he alledgeth for vs? Now if for the compiling of his booke he bestirred himselfe as the Bee, going into other mens gardens for the gathering of hony into his hiue, yet he made no Rabbines of them, to take any thing for hony, because it grew in the garden of such or such a man, but vsed carefull and aduised consideration of that which he wrote, esteeming the weight of his arguments & of his answers, that he might faithfully performe what he did vndertake. But far otherwise haue you dealt *M. Bishop*, in your *marrow & pith*, as you call it, *of many large volumes contracted and drawne into a narrow roome*. You haue made *Bellarmine* (specially your Rabbine, your *magister noster*, you take al vpon his word; if he say it, you will sweare it: if he haue once written it, you will write it againe without any further examination whether it

it be true or falſe. We are beholding to you for tranſlating ſo much of him into Engliſh for their ſakes that doe not vnderſtand the Latin tongue. But *Bellarmine* mocketh and abuſeth you *M. Biſhop*, as he doth euery one that giueth him any truſt. Hee was a man of corrupt and euill conſcience, wholly proſtituted to Antichriſt, and ſold to his deceits, by which meanes he maketh you to ly many times when you do not thinke ye lie. For which cauſe I would aduiſe you when you will write any more bookes out of *Bellarmine*, to make due triall of that which hee ſaith. It may haply doe you good, to make you deteſt his fraud and falſhood, and to hate that profeſſion which cannot be vpholden but by ſuch meanes. There is cauſe you ſhould ſo doe, who from many large volumes can gather no better marrow, no ſounder pith, then that which you haue ſent vs for the *marrow and pith of many large volumes*. Your marrow is but duſt, your pith is but rotteneſſe: there is nothing in your booke fit to ſatisfie the conſcience of a man deſirous to bee inſtructed in the truth. It will I hope ſufficientlie appeare, that you haue neither grounds from the word of God, nor any approoued teſtimony of antiquitie, to warrant any man to embrace that which you maintaine. He that readeath your booke as it becometh a good Chriſtian to doe, and conferreth it with *M. Perkins* booke and our defence thereof, to iudge without partially, I preſume he will take you for a leud and naughtie man, impudent and vnſhamefaſt, regarding onely to vphold a ſide, whithout any entire regard to learne or to teach the truth. In your *poſtſcript* you tell vs that you are ſorie *M. Perkins* being dead, that your booke commeth forth too late to doe him any good. Whereby we conceiue, that you haue a good opinion of it. But wee muſt tell you as touching doing him good in your ſenſe, he was not a man ſo weake as to bee moued with ſuch a toy. Indeed if hee had liued, wee need not doubt but it would haue done him much good, and beene great ioy to him, to ſee that in the *marrow and pith of many large volumes* there ſhould be ſo little matter of moment to be ſaide againſt that which he had written, ſo little and ſo bad, as that wee hope that your *preſeruatiue* will become your owne poiſon, and the bane of that which you thought to ſtrengthen thereby.

# M. BISHOPS ANSVVER TO MASTER PERKINS HIS EPISTLE DEDICATORIE.

MAster Perkins *in his Epistle Dedicatorie saith*, It is a policy of the diuel, to think that our religion & the religiō of the present church of Rom, are al one in substance, or that they may be vnited. *Before I am to deliuer my opinion concerning this point, I had need to be informed what this Author meaneth by these words* our Religion: *For there beeing great diuersities of pretended Religions currant in the world, all contrary to the Church of Rome, how can I certainlie knowe whether of them he professeth? Wherefore (good sir) may it please you to declare what religion you vnderstand when you say* our Religion? *Is it that which* Martin Luther *(a licentious Frier) first preached in Germanie? or rather that which the martiall minister* Zuinglius *contended with sword and shield to set vp in Zwitzerland? or perhaps that which* John Caluin *by sedition wrought into Geneua, expelling the lawful magistrate thence, and by the aide of* Beza *(a dissolute turnecoate) spread into many corners of France? Or if by your Religion you meane onely to comprehend the Religion now practised in England, yet are you farther to shew, whether you vnderstand that established by the State, or the other more refined (as it is thought by many) and embraced by them who are called Puritans, for of their leauen sauoureth that position of yours,* That the article of Christs descent into hel crept into the Creed by negligence, *and some other such like in this book. These principall diuisions of the new Gospell (to omit sundry subdiuisions) beeing famous, and receiued of diuers in England according to each mans fantasie, it is meet you expresse whether of them you speake of, that it may be duly considered how the Romane Religion and it agree, and what vnion may bee made betweene them. Now if you meane the hotchpotch and confusion of all these new Religions together, as by the opposition here vnto the Church of Rome, and by the articles following may be gathered, then I am cleare for you in this, that there can be no more concord between these two Religions then there is between light and darknes, faith and infidelity, Christ and Belial. Notwithstanding I thinke that the reason by you produced to proue the impossibility of this vnion, is of no value, to wit,* that they of the

the Roman church haue razed the foūdatiō, for though in words they honor Christ, yet in deed they turn him into a Pseudo-Christ, and an Idoll of their owne braine. *A verie sufficient cause (no doubt) of eternall breach and diuision, if it could be verified. But how proue you, that we Romane Catholikes, who beleeue Iesus Christ to bee perfect God and perfect man, and the onely Redeemer of mankind, make him a false Christ and an Idoll? or before you go about to proue it, tell me (I pray you) how this can well stand with your owne definition of a reformed Catholike in your Preface? There you affirme him to be* a Catholike reformed *to your liking*, that holdeth the same necessary heads of Religion with the Romane Church. *Now can there be any more necessary head of Religion, then to haue a right faith in Christ? can any other foundation bee laid besides Iesus Christ? If then your reformed Catholike must agree with the Romane Church in necessary heads of Religion, as you hold he e must: either the Roman Church razeth not the foundation, and maketh not Christ a Pseudo Christ as you say here, or else you teach your disciples very pernitiously, to hold the same necessary heads of religion with it. But to leaue you to the reconciliation of these places, let vs examine briefly how you confirme your paradox,* that the Church of Rome maketh Christ a false Christ, *which you go about to proue by foure instāces: The first is, because the seruant of his seruants may change and adde to his commandements, hauing so great power that hee may open and shut heauen to whom hee list, and bind the very conscience with his owne lawes, and consequentlie be partaker of the spirituall kingdome of Christ. Here are diuers reasons hudled vp in one, but all of little moment: for all these seuerall faculties which the* Pope *enioieth, being receiued by the free gift of Christ, and to bee employed in his seruice onely, and to his honour and glorie, are so farre off from making Christ a Pseudo-Christ, that they do highly recommend his most singular bountie towards his followers, without any derogation to his owne diuine prerogatiues. The particulars shall be more particularly answered in their places hereafter. Now I say in a word, that Christs Vicar cannot change any one of Gods cōmandements, nor adde any contrary vnto them, but may well enact and establish some other conformable vnto them which do bind the conscience: for that power is granted of God to euery soueraigne gouernor, as witnesseth* S. Paul, *saying*, Let euery soule be subiect to higher powers, *And that (as it is in the fift verse following)* of necessitie, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. *So that to attribute power vnto one that is vnder*

1 Cor. 3.

Rom. 13.

*Christ, to bind our consciences, is not to make Christ a Pseudo-Christ, but to glorify him, much acknowledging the power which it hath pleased him to giue vnto men. In like manner, what an absurd illation is that, from the power to open and shut heauen gates (which all, both Catholikes & Protestants confesse to haue bin giuen to* S. Peter *and the rest of the Apostles) to inferre, that Christ is made a Pseudo-Christ, as who should say, the master spoiled himselfe of his supreame authority by appointing a steward ouer his houshold, or a porter at his gates: hee must bee both master and man to, belike. And thus much of the first instance.*

R. Abbot.

Wee may well thinke that *M. Bishop* did not well enioy his wits, that would write a booke, and not know what it is whereof he writeth. He hath written a whole booke, such a one as it is, purposelie against *our religion*, and yet will seeme here in the beginning not to know what *our religion* is. But hee knoweth it well enough, and although by an apish imitation of the foolerie of some of his companions, he would make it seeme of many fashions & sorts, by diuersity of names, and by termes of *diuisions and subdiuisions*, yet he seeth & they all see, and by the *harmony of confessions* of al the reformed churches it appeares to their exceeding great griefe, that there is amongst them as great vniformity and consent of Religion, as euer was to be found in their confederacie and banding of themselues against religion. Yea there are many more material differences to be found amongst them, then can be reckoned amongst vs. He that would follow *M. Bishops* veine, might demaund of him, what they meane by the religion of the Church of Rome, whether it bee the religion of Pope *Iohn* the 23. who publikely maintained that [a] there is no eternall life, no resurrection, and that the soule of man perisheth with his body, as doth the soule of the bruite beast: or whether it be the religion of Pope [b] *Leo* the tenth, that held all the faith of Christ to be but a fable. Whether it bee the religion of the Councell of [c] Constance, maintaining the Councell to be aboue the Pope: or the religion of the Councell of Basill, decreeing the Pope to bee aboue the Councell. Whether it be the religion of them [d] that hold the virgin *Mary* to haue beene conceiued without originall sinne, or of them that hold her to haue beene conceiued in sinne. Whether it

*Constantiens. Concil. sess. 11. Pertinaciter dixit, asseruit, dogmatizauit & asseruit vitam aeternam non esse, neque aliam post hanc, &c.*

*[b] Bale de Act. Rom. Pontif. in Leo 10. Quantis nobis ac cœtui nostro profuit ista fabula de Iesu Christo.*

*[c] Sess. 4. Generali concilio quilibet cuiuscunque status vel dignitatis etiamsi Papalis fuerit, obedire tenetur.*

*[d] Erasm. Epist. ad oper. Hilarij. Asseuerans virginem matrem immunem à peccato originis apud Dominicales hereticus est, apud Scotistas & bonos.*

it bee the religion of *Thomas Aquinas*, that holdeth [e] that a dogge or a ſwine eating the Sacrament doth eat the verie body of Chriſt: or the religion of the [f] Maſter of the ſentences, who cannot tell what the dogge eateth: or the religion of them that ſay, as [g] *Aquinas* reporteth, that ſo ſoone as the dogge or the mouſe toucheth the Sacrament, ſtraightwaies the body of Chriſt is taken vp into heauen. Whether it bee the religion of [h] *Pighius* and *Catharinus*, who hold originall ſinne to be a meere priuation: or the religion of *Dominicus a Soto*, who holdeth it as his fellowes do, to be a poſitiue corruption. Whether it bee the religion of the [i] Diuines of Colein, who with [k] *Pighius* hold, that we are iuſtified by the imputed righteouſneſſe of Chriſt as the Proteſtants, or of the reſt that hold that wee are iuſtified by a formall inherent righteouſneſſe of our owne. Whether it be the religion of [l] *Oſorius*, condemning the doctrine of *S. Auſtine* concerning predeſtination: or the religion of [m] *Cæſar Baronius*, who acknowledgeth the ſame to be true. Whether it be the religion of [n] *Alfunſus de Caſtro*, affirming that the Pope may erre: or the religion of them that affirme he cannot erre. Whether it bee the religion of the Ieſuits, maintaining [o] that a man who is no Chriſtian may bee Pope, and that ſtewes are as lawfull at Rome as the Pope himſelfe: or the religion of the Seculars, that condemne theſe for wicked and falſe poſitions. Whether it be the religion of [p] *Dureus* the Ieſuite, defending that the Church may make a booke canonicall Scripture, which from the beginning was not ſo: or the religion of [q] *Andradius*, affirming that the Church hath no ſuch authoritie. I might lead him along through *Bellarmines* controuerſies, and ſhew how he alledgeth two, three, foure, and ſometimes more opinions amongſt them of ſundry points of their religion, and in euery of them I might queſtion, whether or which we ſhall take to be the religion of the Church of Rome? Now if hee will anſwer, that men may haue priuate opinions and followers therein, which yet may not be vrged as preiudiciall to the currant and commonly receiued doctrine of the Church, in which ſort their [r] Thomiſt, and Scotiſts, and Occamiſts haue been diuided one from another in the boſome of their Church, then let that little diſcretion that hee hath ſerue him againſt another time to vnderſtand, that it is no preiudice to our religion that there is in ſome matters ſome diuerſity of opinions amongſt vs, or that ſome men be exorbitant from that which is commonly,

[e] *Thom. Aquin. p. 3. q. 80. art. 3. ad. 3.*
[f] *Sent. 4. diſt. 13.*
[g] *Vt ſupra.*
[h] *Pigh. de pec. cato originali. Catharin. de lapſu hominis &c. cap. 6.*
[i] *Co'on. in Antididag.*
[k] *Pigh. de fide & iuſtif.*
[l] *Oſor. de Juſt. lib. 9:*
[m] *Baron. Annal. lib. 6.*
[n] *Alfonſ. aduer. hæreſ. lib. 1. cap. 4 & 8.*
[o] *Declarat. ſacerd. ad Clement. 8. pag. 29.*
[p] *Dureus contra Whitaker. li. 2.*
[q] *Andrad. defenſ. fidei Triden: lib. 3.*
[r] *Alfonſ. de Caſtro aduerſus hær. lib. 1. cap. 7.*

monly amongst vs approued for the truth. There is an vniuersalitie of doctrine with them, for which men are esteemed of their religion, in the particulars whereof notwithstanding there are many differences, for which they will not be thought to bee one of one religion and another of another. What infinite varietie of obseruation and discipline is there found amongst their Friers and Monkes, and yet they take them to bee all of one religion? There was of old a great dissension betwixt [f] *Polycrates* the Metropolitan of the Asian Churches, and *Victor* Bishop of Rome, concerning the obseruation of the feast of Easter; betwixt [t] *Cyprian* and *Stephanus* Bishop of Rome, with their Churches on each part, about the rebaptizing of them that were baptized by heretikes; betwixt [u] *Chrysostome* and *Epiphanius* first, and after betwixt [x] *Hierome* and *Ruffinus*, concerning the condemning of the works of *Origen*; betwixt [y] *Chrysostome* and many other Bishops, concerning the often restitution of penitents to the communion of the Church; betwixt [z] *Hierome* and *Austine*, concerning *Peters* dissimulation, and yet were they neuer taken to be of diuers religions vntill this day. And what? are we then in worse case then all these, that because there is some variance betwixt some of vs in some points of doctrine, or betwixt some others in matters of ceremony and circumstance concerning the discipline of the Church, therefore we must be sorted into so many Religions as *M. Bishops* idle head can deuise differences amongst vs? This is to be contemned, as a peeuish and impertinent cauill of contentious and wrangling Sophisters, bewraying more malice then learning or wit, making shew to the vnlearned of obiecting somewhat against vs, when their obiection maketh more against themselues then it doth against vs. Now then if *M. Perkins* either concerning Christs *descending into hell*, or some other like matters subiect to variety of opinion, were otherwise minded then standeth with truth or the common iudgement of our Church, wee do not therefore account him a man of other religion, but a maintainer of our religion, and we will say of him as *Austine* said of *Cyprian*, [a] *Therefore did he not see somewhat, that by him a greater matter might be seene*, namelie that in difference of iudgement we are not to bee contentious, but labour with all our might to preserue the publike peace and vnitie of the Church, and with modestie and loue to carie our selues towards them that in opinion dissent from vs. A notable example whereof

[f] *Euseb. hist. lib. 5. cap. 22. 23.*
[t] *Cyprian. ad Pompeium. cont. epist. Stephani et Concil. Carthag. apud Cyprian.*
[u] *Socrat. hist. lib. 6. cap 13.*
[x] *Hieron. aduer. Ruffin.*
[y] *Socrat. lib 7. cap. 19.*
[z] *August: epist: 19.*
[a] *August:*

whereof we see in *M. Caluine*, who when *Luther* vpon some matter of question, behaued himselfe somewhat intemperately against him and some others alike minded as he was, was wont to say, [b] *Though hee should call mee diuell, yet will I do him this honour, to acknowledge him an excellent seruant of God.* As for the imputations which heere *M. Bishop* laieth vpon him and the rest whom hee nameth, we account them but as the barking of a curre dogge against a Lion; they are stale and threedbare cauils, and too well knowne to cause them that reproch that hee desireth. If *Luther* were *licentious* for marrying a wife, what were their Popes and Cardinals, their Bishops, and Priests, and Monks, for keeping other mens wiues, and retaining concubines and harlots of their owne? If *Zuinglius* went armed into the field to giue encouragement to his countriemen for their iust and necessarie defence, is he thereupon to bee taxed for a *martial minister*, more then *Iulius* the second for a *martial Pope*, who himselfe went in person against the French, and going ouer the bridge of Tiber, cast his crosse-keies into the riuer, and tooke his sword in his hand, saying, [c] *Seeing Peters keies will do no good, we will try whether Pauls sword wil serue the turne?* or then *Philip* the French Bishop in the time of king *Richard* the first, for a *martial Bishop*, who bare armes against king *Richard*, and was taken in battell, in whose behalfe when the Pope wrot to the King, requesting fauour for his sonne, the King sent to him the Bishops armour with this message, *Vide an tunica filij tui sit an non, See whether this bee thy sonnes coate or not?* Nay it is no rare matter to finde examples of *martiall Popes* and *martiall Cardinals and Bishops* in the Church of Rome; & therefore we need say no more to *M. Bishop* as touching this cauill, but onlie to bid him looke at home. As for that which hee saith of *Caluins* expelling of the lawfull Magistrate out of *Geneua*, it is a verie malicious and false tale, it beeing verie euident, that the Bishop of *Geneua* whom hee meaneth, with his clergie, perceiuing the people to be minded for the abolishing of Popish superstition and receiuing of the Gospell, voluntarily fled from thence before *Caluins* comming to that place. Last of all, he calleth *Beza a dissolute turne-coat:* but if a man should ask his wisdome, why he doth so, hee cannot tell. All the matter of this *dissolutenes* is, that being vnder twenty yeeres old, or a litle aboue, he wrote a booke of Epigrammes, in which by imitation of *Catullus* and *Ouid*, he expressed some things more

[b] *Caluin. epi.* 57.

[c] *Bale in Iul.* 2.

[d] *Matt. Paris in Richard.* 1.

more licentiously and wantonlie then was fit. The writing thereof hee afterwards when God had called him to the knowledge of his truth [e] repented much; and when hee was requested that the same might be reprinted, denied it vtterlie, and wished the remembrance thereof to bee wholly buried. In his conuersation otherwise hee was neuer to bee touched with any blemish of that lightnesse, which in those poeticall exercises hee made shew of. And is not this a great matter, that these men obiect so often to his disgrace? Surely if the liues of sundrie of the ancient Fathers were looked into with such eies, before they were come to Christ, there would bee found worse matters to vpbraid them with, euen by their owne confession, then this is. *S. Austin* when the Donatists dealt with him, as *M. Bishop* and his fellowes do with *Beza*, gaue answere to them thus: [f] *Looke how much they blame my fault, so much doe I commend and praise my Physition.* To which effect, I haue heard that *Beza* himself answered one as touching that calumniation: *Hic homo inuidet mihi gratiam Christi, This man enuieth me the grace of Christ.* Surely, that should haue been no fault, though it had beene much greater, if hee had continued one of them. But what would they haue said, if *Beza* had done as [g] *Ioannes à Casa* their Archbishop of *Beneuentum* did, who wrote an Italian poeme in commendation of Sodomie, and printed it at *Venice*, professing himself to be delighted with that horrible filthinesse, and that he knew no venerie but that: or as [h] Pope *Sixtus* the fourth, who built a *Stewes* at *Rome* for the exercise of that vnnatural and monstrous lust? How many such filthie dogges are there found amongst the Romane Sages, who yet with them must go for sacred and holy Fathers, whilest *Beza* for a few verses written when hee was yet but a boy, must bee subiect to their reprochfull malice all his life, yea and after his death also? But the thing that troubleth *M. Bishop* indeed is, that *Beza* became a *turncoate*, for that he cast off the liuerie of Antichrist, the badge & cognisance of the man of sinne, and betooke himselfe to the profession and seruice of Iesus Christ. VVell and happie were it for him, if he had turned his coate in the like sort, if he had put on the garment of Christ crucified; which though it might seeme base in the eies of the proud harlot of Rome, yet should make him glorious in the eies of God, and yeeld him acceptation before him. Now the Articles of our Religion set downe by *M. Perkins*, he calleth *the hatch-*

[e] *Beza Confes. Epist. Dedicat.*

[f] *August. contr. lit. Petil. lib. 3. cap. 10. Quantumcunque ille accusat vitium meum, tantum ego laudo medicum meum.*

[g] *Bale. Act. Rom. Pontif. in Iulio 3.*

[h] *Ibid. in Sixt. 4. ex Orat. Henr. Agipp. ad Iona.*

*hotchpoch of all those new religions*, because he well knoweth, that we on all sides agree in the maintenance of these Articles, and therfore are indeed but one religion. Whereby the Reader may easily conceiue, how idle his obiection is of diuisions and subdiuisions. But of this *hotchpotch* he hath tasted, and by this time it hath made his stomack very sicke, and I beleeue it will cast him into a disease from which he will neuer be able to recouer againe.

Of the religion in these articles expressed, hee confesseth, that it can admit no reconcilement with the Church of Rome, but he liketh not the reason which *M. Perkins* alledgeth of the impossibility of this vnion. His reason is, *Because they of the Romane Church haue razed the foundation, and though in words they honour Christ, yet indeed do turn him into a Pseudo Christ and an Idol of their own brain.* Against this reason *M. Bishop* alledgeth the explication that *M. Perkins* maketh of his *Reformed Catholike*, to be any one that *holds the same necessary heads of Religion with the Romane Church*: whereto is added by *M. Perkins*, which *M. Bishop* omitteth: *Yet so, as he pares off and reiects all errors in doctrine, whereby the same religion is corrupted.* Hereupon *M. Bishop* asketh, *Can there bee a more necessary head of Religion, then to haue a right faith in Christ?* which is very clerkely and well applied, and sheweth him to bee a man of deep insight into dark points. Surely to haue a right faith in Christ would not be vnderstood for a *head* of religion, but for the whole effect (in a manner) and substance of it. *M. Perkins* by *necessarie heads of religion*, vnderstandeth those generalities and principles whereof there is no question betwixt the Church of *Rome* and vs, which for the points that hee handleth, hee hath set downe vnder the name of *our consents* in the beginning of euery question. These he will haue his *Reformed Catholique* still to hold with them, but to detest the absurdities and errors, which they teach in the deduction and application of these generalities. Therefore he doth not say as touching those principles, that they raze the foundation; but the razing of the foundation consisteth in the indirect vse and applying thereof. There is a generality of doctrine to which Heretikes accord, and vnder the cloud whereof many times they couer their heresies, euen as the Pelagian Heretikes hid the poison of their heresies vnder the acknowledgement of the *grace and helpe of God*, but bewrayed the same notably when they were vrged to

specifie

ſpecifie what they meant by the ſame grace. So doth the Church of Rom acknowledge the incarnation of Chriſt, his paſſion, death and reſurrection, his aſcenſion, and interceſſion at the right hand of God; but in aſſigning the vſe and effect of all theſe things and the reſt, they make Chriſt in a manner no Chriſt at all. *M. Biſhop* therefore might eaſily haue ſeene, but that hee was willing to ſhew either his ignorance in not vnderſtanding, or his learning in cauilling, that *M. Perkins* might well ſay without any contradiction, that the Church of Rome had razed the foundation, and yet wiſh his *Reformed Catholike* ſtill to hold thoſe neceſſarie heads of religion, which ſtill remaine in the acknowledgement and profeſſion of the Church of Rome. Now *M. Perkins* giueth foure inſtances of their iuſtling of Chriſt out of his place. The firſt ſtandeth in the popes vſurping of the ſpirituall kingdome of Chriſt, by changing his commandements, and adding to them: by taking vpon him to open and ſhut heauen to whom he will; by binding mens conſciences with his decrees. But *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that Chriſts giuing of theſe faculties to the Pope, doth moſt highly recommend his ſingular bountie towards his followers, and is no derogation to himſelfe. Which he telleth vs vpon his own word. But as for me, I haue read ouer the new Teſtament diuers times, & yet could I neuer light vpon any place where Chriſt hath made any mention of the Pope, or of any faculties that he would beſtow vpon him. We read of Antichriſt the man of ſinne, that *he ſhould ſit in the temple of God*, and take vpon him to command as God; but wee finde not that Chriſt did euer appoint any man to execute any ſuch place. Out of doubt Chriſt would ſomewhere or other haue ſpoken of it, if he had intended any ſuch courſe. But *M. Biſhop* taketh it to be a great glorie to Chriſt, to haue a Vicar here vpon earth with a triple Crowne, clothed like *Dines* in purple and fine linnen, & faring deliciouſly euerie day: beſpangled with gold, and beſparkled with Iewels, and caried about like an Idoll vpon the ſhoulders of men, hauing Emperours, and Kings, and Princes to attend him, to hold his ſtirrop, to powre him water, to kiſſe his foote, and all at his deuotion, either to ſet them vp, or to pul them downe; yea hauing power ouer heauen, and earth, and purgatorie, (the only ſpite is, that hee hath no power to keepe himſelfe from hell) and that hee ſhould make lawes, and giue diſpenſations againſt Gods lawes, and like

2 Theſſ. 2. 4.

like a Lord of misrule, turne all things vpside downe. O what a goodly matter had it been, that Christ should haue made al his seruants like Popes here in the world, and all other people vassals & tributaries vnto them? what a golden world would that haue been, and how much would it haue renowned the bounty of Christ? Well, M. *Bishop*, we wish you to consider throughly of the matter; we cannot see in the Gospell, but that you may as well take vpon you to be a Pope as he that is Pope, & you may as stoutly alledge for your selfe, that your Popedome doth highly recommend the bounty of Christ. But it seemeth to vs, that you do too much abridge the Popes vsing of his faculties, when you mention the employing of them onely in Christs seruice, & to his honor and glorie. Let him, M. *Bishop*, first serue himselfe, let him enlarge *S. Peters* patrimonie, and aduance the glorie of his owne seate; let him proclame Iubilees and Pardons, that he may gather gold and treasure; let him claw them that claw him, & wreake his anger vpon them that resist him: as for Christ he is but a poore man, let him attend for the reuersion, a little wil serue him. This deuice of theirs is wholly to bee derided: their words are the words of shameless hypocrites, not blushing to auouch the bounty of Christ in an authority, which though there were from time to time after fiue or sixe hundred yeeres diuers degrees and steppes vnto it, yet in that sort, as they now defend it, was not knowne in the world for the space of eight or nine hundred yeeres after the time of Christ: which hath no warrant of the Gospell of Christ, nor sauoreth at all of the kingdome of Christ: which the ancient Fathers neuer dreamed of, and could not haue gone without most illustrious & cleere testimony & witnesse amongst thē, if euer it had been practised in their times. Let them in all antiquitie parallell the Pope, and we will neuer open mouth further to speake against them: but because they cannot so do, let them confesse themselues to be false wretches, and him to be a Pseudochrist, a false and counterfeit Christ, in truth verie Antichrist himselfe, who by hypocrisie hath intruded himselfe to sit in the place of Jesus Christ. But M. *Bishop* telleth vs, that their Vicar cannot *change any one of Gods Commandements, nor adde any contrary vnto them.* Where wee see, that the Pope apparantlie doth that which they are ashamed to defend. They well knowe that he setteth nothing at all by the lawes of God, and that whilst

he

he taketh vpon him to be the expounder thereof, he maketh what meaning he list thereof, and thereby giueth himselfe liberty to doe what he list, and yet to say, he doth nothing against the law of God It hath bene holden for a rule among them, as *Bodin* mentioneth, [k] *That hee is safe enough with God, who by the Pope is freed from the lawes of God.* Thus haue they told vs, and according to that they haue told vs they haue practised, that [l] *the Pope aboue law can dispense of law by the fulnesse of his power*; that [m] *hee can dispense against the Apostle, against the Canons of the Apostle, and against the old Testament*; that [n] *it may well be maintained that he doth dispense against the Apostle.* Shall we not thinke that hee changeth and thwarteth the commandement of Christ, who with a *Non obstante* taketh that away which Christ hath saide, *Drinke ye all of this*: [o] *This notwithstanding* the Church doth thus and thus? Doth not he contrarie Gods commandement, who requireth of vs to worship Idols and Images, when God hath forbidden so to doe? When God hath charged subiects to be obedient to their princes and Gouernours, doth he not crosse the commandement of God, who taketh vpon him to dispense with them [p] for oathes of allegiance, and giueth them licence to rebell? Doth not hee make the law of God of no effect, who giueth licence of marriage in those degrees of affinity and bloud, in which God hath forbidden any marriage to be accounted lawfull; as was here done in England to king *Henry* the eight for the marriage of his brothers wife, and to *Philip* the late king of Spain, for the marriage of his owne sisters daughter? Many such other matters are there wherein this Vicar of Rome grosly and palpably bendeth himselfe against God, and yet these hypocrites are so impudent, as that either by expositions they will seem to defend them, or else if they can find no meanes for defence, they vtterly deny them. Thus *M. Bishop* will heere make vs beleeue, that the Pope maketh lawes onely conformable to Gods lawes, when as by that which he himselfe addeth, he proueth him therein presumptuously and arrogantly to put himselfe into the place of God. For to make lawes and publish doctrines to bind the conscience, belongeth onely to Christ, who in that respect is called the [q] *one Lawgiuer*, [r] *one Lord*, [s] *one Doctor and Master.* Yet *M. Bishop* maketh this a thing common to euery Soueraigne gouernour, and taketh vpon him to proue it by S. *Paul*, saying, [t] *Let euery soule bee*

k *Bodin. de republ. lib. 1. cap. 8. Qui a pontifice maximo diuinis legibus solutus sit, huic apud deū immortalem satis cautum esse. Canon. incorrupta. 1 Decret. Greg. de concess. prabend. ca. 3. Proposuit. secundum plenitudinem potestatis de iure posse summu supra ius dispensare.*

m *Ibid. in glossa. Papa dispensat contra Apostolū, & contra Canones Apostol. & contra vetus Testamentum.*

n *25. Sunt quidam in glossa. satis posest sustineri quod papa contra Apostolū dispensat.*

o *Concil Constantien. sess. 13. Hec non obstante. p. 15 q. 1. Authoritatem, & ibid. Alius.*

q *Iam. 4. 12.*

r *Ephes. 4. 5.*

s *Mat. 23. 8. 10.*

t *Rom. 13. 1. 5.*

*be subiect to the higher powers, and that for conscience sake.* But hee abuseth the words of the Apostle, which haue no intendment concerning their Vicar, but are spoken of the *highers powers*, that is, of the temporall and ciuill gouernours, either [u] *the King as the superior, or other rulers that are sent by him*, as S. *Peter* giueth vs to vnderstand the meaning thereof. Therefore *Chrysostome* expoundeth the words thus; *Let euery soule be subiect*, [x] *though thou bee an Apostle, though thou be an Euangelist, though thou be a Prophet*; thereby informing vs, that Apostles, Euangelists, Prophets, are of the soules that are to bee subiect, and not *the higher powers* to which the subiection there spoken of is required. The Apostle did not write it to chalenge thereby a subiection to S. *Peter*, or to himselfe, but to acknowledge a subiection due to bee performed by them and others to the ciuill power. Againe, the Apostle teacheth vs *for conscience sake* to be subiect to the *higher powers*: he teacheth vs not, that the *conscience* is bound as touching the things themselues wherein we are to shew our subiection to the *higher powers*. Lawes are sayd to *bind the conscience*, when they tie the conscience to the things themselues which they command, as to bee perswaded of a religious and necessarie dutie and seruice therein immediatly performed vnto God; the transgressing whereof to bee a sinne against God, not onely mediately by not yeelding subiection to the Lawgiuer, but immediately, in the very thing it selfe, which it hath done or left vndone. It is the prerogatiue of God onely to tie the conscience in this sort, and whosoeuer else taketh vpon him thus to doe, hee is an vsurper against God. And thus doth the Pope bind mens consciences; he maketh his lawes matters of religion, and of the worship of God, and will haue men beleeue, that in the very doing of the things which he commandeth, they immediatly please God, merit at the hands of God, make satisfaction to him for their sinnes and purchase eternall life. On the other side, that in the trespasse thereof, not onely in respect of disobedience to the higher powers, but for the very not doing of the things themselues, there is sinne against God, a breach and wound of conscience, and the guilt of euerlasting death. This is one speciall matter for which we iustly detest that Romish Idol, and do chalenge him, not onely for *sitting in the Temple of God*, by vsurping an outward superiority in the visible state of the Church, but also for [y] *sitting as God in the*

[u] 1. Pet. 2. 13.

[x] *Chrysost. in Rom. hom.* 23.

[y] 2. Thes. 2. 4.

*temple of God* by chalenging to himselfe and possessing in such sort as hath beene sayd, the consciences of men, in which God onely ought to raigne. As for Princes and temporall gouernours, if they keepe them within their bounds, they make no lawes in that kind: for causes seeming good vnto them, they require outward conformity and obedience to their lawes for conscience sake of the authority committed vnto them of God, but they leaue the conscience free from any inward opinion or perswasion of the things themselues wherein they require to bee obeyed. Heere therefore a man is outwardly bound and seruant to the law, but inwardly hee still continueth free to God, being perswaded, that the doing or not dooing of such or such a thing, in and for it selfe, maketh him to God neither the better nor the worse, and therefore the thing in it selfe being eyther way indifferent to God, he yeeldeth himselfe in the outward man vpon conscience of giuing obedience to the power seruiceable and conformable to the law. And this is that *Christian liberty* which the Scripture teacheth; which is not, as some men would haue it, a licentious immunity in outward things to doe euery man what we list, but a freedome of the heart from any seruile opinion of any thing that wee doe. The doctrine whereof *Luther* very excellently propounded in two paradoxes, as they seemed to them that vnderstood them not, as touching conuersation in outward things, that [a] *a Christian man is free from all men, a Lord and subiect to no man*; And again, that *a Christian man is a diligent seruant and vassall to all men, and subiect to al.* Inwardly in conscience he is free & bound to nothing, but faith, [b] *All things are lawfull for me.* Outwardly in conuersation hee is bound to that that is *expedient* and serueth for *edification*; whereby he may yeeld obedience to gouernours, loue to neighbours, instruction to the ignorant, strengthening to the weake, comfort to the strong, good example to them that are without, auoiding all scandall whereby he should cause the liberty whereof he is inwardly perswaded, to be blasphemed and slandered. Now therefore Princes in their lawes are to be obeyed vpon conscience of their authoritie, being from God, but this hindereth not, but that the Pope is iustly accused for thrusting Christ out of his place, by requiring obedience vppon conscience of the things themselues which hee commandeth. As for the opening and shutting of heauen, wee doubt not but that the

[a] *Luther de libert: Christiana.*

[b] 1 Cor. 10. 23

Pope,

Pope, if he be the minister of Christ, may challenge the office and function thereof, according to the tenor of the commission wherwith Christ hath left it to his Church. But he not contented with that authority which Christ hath left indifferently to the ministry of the Church, immediatly from Christ himselfe deriued in common to the whole body of the Church, vsurpeth vnto himselfe a singularity in this behalfe, making himselfe in Christs steed the head from whence the power of binding and loosing is deriued to all the rest, and in that respect at his owne pleasure reseruing to himselfe a prerogatiue of speciall cases and causes, which are most for his aduantage, wherein no man may meddle but himselfe. It is true, that the master by appointing a steward ouer his household or a porter at his gates, doth not diuest himselfe of his supreame authority; but sith it is the peculiar honour of the Lord to giue that power, & to determine the offices and places of his seruants, surely he who being left but a steward of a house, will lift vp himselfe to be a Lieutenant generall of a Realme, and of a Porter will make himselfe a Potentate, and take vpon him to be euen as the Lord himself, he is to be taken for no other but a Traitor to his Lord, & therefore is by his fellow seruants to be resisted in his course. This is the Popes case. Hee had the keies of heauen committed vnto him in cõmon with his fellow seruants, to euery man for his part and portion of the Lords house: and to the great disturbance and disorder of the house, he hath challenged vnto himselfe the soueraignty and Lordship of the whole. He hath made himselfe master of the Church, and all the rest seruants vnto him. By this extrauagant and exorbitant power he handleth all things as he list, and abuseth the keies to shut them out of heauen, so farre as hee can, who in the behalfe of their master doe seeke to hinder his wicked and vngodly proceedings. What then shall we adiudge him, but a Traitor to his Lord and master Iesus Christ, vsurping that which is proper to Christ alone? In a word, *M. Bishop* must vnderstand, that though the Popedome were drowned in Tiber, and Babylon were cast as a millstone into the Sea, yet Christ needeth not to be master and man too, but without the Pope, hath seruants enow to attend him in his seruice.

W. BISHOP.

*Come wee now to the second: It is, that we make Christ an Idoll, for albeit we call him a Sauiour, yet in vs, in that hee giues his grace to vs, that by our merits we may be our owne sauiours, &c. I maruell, in whom he should be a sauiour if not in vs: What, is he the Sauiour of Angels or of any other creatures? I hope not, but the mischiefe is, that hee giues grace to vs, that thereby we may merit & so become our owne sauiours. This is a phrase vnheard of among Catholikes, that any man is his owne sauiour, neither doth it follow of that position, that good workes are meritorious; but well that we apply vnto vs the saluation, which is in Christ Iesus, by good workes; as the Protestants auouch they do by faith onely: In which sense the Apostle* S. Paul *saith to his deere Disciple* Timothie. For this doing thou shalt saue both thy selfe, and them that heare thee. 1 Tim. 4.

*And this doth no more diminish the glory of our Soueraigne Sauiours infinite merits, then to say that we are saued by faith only: good workes no lesse depending, if not more aduancing Christs merits, then only faith, as shall bee proued hereafter more at large in the question of merits. Now that other good mens merits may steed them, who want some of their owne, may be deduced out of an hundred places of the Scriptures, namely out of those where God saith,* That for the sake of one of his true seruants, he will shew mercie to thousands, *as is expresly saide in the end of the first commandement.*

*In like manner I answer vnto your third instance, that for Christ to haue taken away by his blessed Passion the eternall paine due vnto our sinnes, and to haue left a temporall to bee satisfied by vs, is not to make himselfe a false Christ, but a most louing, kind, and withall a most prudent Redeemer, wiping away that by himselfe, which passed our forces, and reseruing that to vs, which by the helpe of his grace, wee well may and ought to do: not onely because it were vnseemely, that the parts of the body, should be disproportionable to the head: but also because it is reasonable (as the Apostle holdeth,) that we suffer heere with Christ* Rom. 8. *before we raigne with him in his kingdome. In your last instance you say, that wee make Christ our mediator of intercession to God, thinking out of your simplicity, that therein wee much magnifie him, and sing* Osanna *vnto him. Whereas we hold it for no small disparagement vnto his diuine dignity, to make him our Intercessor, that is, to pray him to pray for vs, who is of himselfe, right able to helpe vs in all wee can demand;*

*maund; being as well God, as Man. And albeit one in thought singling out the humanity of Christ from his diuine nature and person, might make it an intercessor for vs; Yet that being but a Metaphysicall conceipt, to separate the nature from the person; since the* Arian *heresie (which held Christ to be inferior to his Father) it hath not beene practised by Catholikes, who alwaies pray our Sauiour Christ to haue mercie vpon vs, neuer to pray for vs. And consequently make him no mediator of intercession, but of redemption.*

R. ABBOT.

The second instance giuen by *M. Perkins*, to proue that the Church of Rome maketh Christ but euen as an Idol, giuing him a name without the substance and effect thereof, is this, that they call him *a Sauiour*, and yet make him *a Sauiour* onely in vs and by vs, not in himselfe or immediatly by himselfe. For this is all that they attribute vnto him, that he putteth vs in case and state, to saue our selues, and to become our owne Sauiours. The meaning of the instance being plaine, *M. Bishops* question is very idle, *In whom he should be a Sauiour if not in vs.* He should be a *Sauiour* in himselfe, and by that that he doth himselfe, and not in vs, or by that that we doe for our selues. But to the matter, he telleth vs, that it *is a phrase vnheard of among Catholikes, that any man is his owne sauiour.* Which we confesse as touching the phrase and word, but yet by their doctrine they doe in truth make a man his owne Sauiour. If they should so say in words, they well know that al Christian eares would abhorre them, and many that now admire them, would spit in their faces, and account them accursed and damnable hypocrites, who vnder pretence of doeing honour vnto Christ, do rob him of his honour, and bereaue him of the truth of that name wherein the Soueraignty of his glory doth consist: therefore they forbeare the words, though that which they teach is the same in effect as if they said so. It is commonly knowne, that the effect is alwaies attributed to that which is the immediate and neerest efficient cause. We say in Philosophy, *Sol & homo generant hominem, The sunne and a man doe beget a man*, because by the vegetation and influence of the Sunne and heauenly powers it is deemed that a man hath power to beget a man. Yet wee know that the Sunne or the heauen is not called the father of the child, but onely the

man by whom the child is begotten. *So* is it therefore in the matter that we haue here in hand. *M. Bishop* saith, that God [a] *freely bestoweth his grace vpon vs in Baptisme, but all that arriue to the yeares of discretion must by the good vse of the same grace either merit life, or for want of such fruit of it, fall into the miserable state of death.* God then giueth vs whereof to doe it, but we our selues of that which God giueth must effect and deserue our owne saluation. Therefore *M. Bishop* againe compareth the grace of God to a [b] Farme, which the father bestoweth vpon his Sonne, who of the commodities that arise of the good vsage thereof, groweth to bee able to make a further purchase at his fathers hands, euen of any thing that his father will set to sale. In which case the father cannot be said to bee the purchaser, or to make the purchase for the sonne, but the Sonne is the purchaser for himselfe, though by that which his father gaue him, through the well ordering of it, hee became able to make the purchase. Seeing then that Christ doth onely giue vs that whereof we our selues are to raise merits to deserue and purchase saluation, as they teach, it must needs follow by their doctrine, that Christ is made the more remote and antecedent cause, but we our selues are properly and immediately the true causes of our owne saluation. Howsoeuer therefore they vse not the phrase, yet they teach the thing it selfe, that Christ is not our Sauiour properly, but we our selues by the good vsage of his gifts, are the Sauiours of our selues. Which absurdity *M. Bishop* saw, that standing to their owne grounds, he could by no meanes auoide, and therefore is content with *Pighius* (as it seemeth) for a present shift, to retire into our harbour; albeit I verily thinke, he vnderstandeth not himselfe, nor can tell, what meaning to make of that he saith. The thing that followeth of the assertion of meritorious works, he saith, is this, that *by good works wee apply vnto vs the saluation which is in Christ Iesus, as* (saith he) *the Protestants auouch they do by faith onely.* But hee should here haue told vs, how his meaning is, that this *saluation* is in *Christ*. For if he meane, (as commonly he doth) that it is in Christ, because God for Christs sake giueth vs grace whereby to merit and deserue our saluation, then he dallieth altogether, and mocketh his Reader, as if he should say, It followeth not of the position of meritorious works, that wee are our owne sauiours, but that wee apply vnto our selues by good works, that whereby we

are

[a] Of merits sect. 1.

[b] Ibid. sect. 3.

are made our owne sauiours. But if he meane, as the Protestants do, when they auouch, that by faith onely we apply vnto our selues the saluation which is in Christ Iesus, that is, that this saluation is entirely in the merits of Christ, deseruing and purchasing the same for vs, and that meerely and immediatly for Christs sake God bestoweth the same vpon vs; that wee do but onely stretch foorth the hand (and that by his gift also) to receiue that which freely and of his meere mercy he giueth vnto vs, then his meritorious works are come to nought, and hee bestoweth a great deale of labour in vaine for the proofe thereof. Wee would gladly see which way hee will shift. Surely if our good workes do but apply vnto vs the saluation which is in Christ, then they cānot be said to merit saluation themselues. For that that applieth, doth not worke the effect of that which it doth applie. The hand that applieth the medicine, cannot be said it selfe to worke the cure: for if it performe the effect it selfe, to what end doth it apply another thing for the same purpose? But if our workes doe merit saluation themselues, then they doe more then apply vnto vs the saluation which is in Christ Iesus, and wee must bee said according to the absurditie before mentioned, to bee thereby our owne sauiours. Let the Reader well obserue, how hee stealeth away in a cloud of ambiguous words, which notwithstanding howsoeuer he expound, do worke inconuenience to himselfe. But by his owne words he giueth answer to the place which he obiecteth of *Paul*, saying to *Timothie*, that [c] *so doing, hee should both saue himselfe and them that heard him*; that he did not meane, that *Timothy* should doe that for himselfe, by vertue whereof hee should be saued, but onely that hee should apply vnto himselfe the saluation which is in Christ Iesus. Hee was to *saue them that heard him*, not by meritig their saluation for them, but by preachiug vnto them [d] *the Gospell by which they were saued*. So was hee also to *saue himselfe*, by continuing in the same faith and doctrine of the Gospell, whereby the way of saluation is set foorth vnto vs. In the same manner *S. Peter* exhorteth the Iewes, who were pricked in their hearts at the hearing of his preaching, [e] *Saue your selues from this wicked generation*: namely, by receiuing and accepting the message of saluation by Iesus Christ. Wee are said to *saue our selues*, as we are said to feed our selues, and to cure our selues. Wee feed our selues, not by beeing food and nourishment to our selues, but by

c 1. Tim. 4. 16.

d 1. Cor. 15. 2.

e Act. 2. 40.

receiuing that which is our foode. We cure our ſelues, not by being a medicine to our ſelues, but by taking and applying to vs that whereby we are cured. So we ſaue our ſelues onely by embracing Ieſus Chriſt, by whom onely we are ſaued. And this wee entend, when we ſay, that we are ſaued by *faith onely*: namely, that faith only is the inſtrument whereby we lay hold on Ieſus Chriſt, in whoſe onely merits our ſaluation wholly and immediately doth conſiſt. Which doctrine of faith wholly aduanceth the glory of Chriſt, becauſe it referreth all entirely to him, not onely for that we confeſſe that faith is the gift of Chriſt, but alſo becauſe we teach that it is not by any vertue of faith it ſelfe by which we are ſaued, but onely by the merit and power of Chriſt, whom we receiue by faith. How then doth *M. Biſhop* ſay, that their aſſertion of our merits doth *no more diminiſh the glory of the merits of Chriſt, then it doth that wee ſay, that we are ſaued by faith onely*, when as they leaue ſo much for man to glory of in himſelfe, his aſſenting to grace, and working therewith by his owne free will, and his well vſing thereof to merit and deſerue ſaluation for himſelfe; when as we ſay, that wee are ſaued meerly by the merits of Chriſt, and haue nothing in any ſort to attribute to our ſelues, and they ſay, that wee are not ſaued meerely by the merits of Chriſt, but the merits of Chriſt do onely make vs able by free wil to deſerue our owne ſaluatiõ? But of this (as he ſaith) we ſhall haue further occaſion to ſpeake in the queſtion of merits. Now here *M. Perkins* noteth it for a further abſurdity of their doctrine of merits, that they doe not onelie make men their owne ſauiours, but make one man alſo the ſauiour of another, whileſt that in the want of our owne merits, we may bee partakers in the merits of the Saints. *M. Biſhop* being a man of a wide throate to ſwallow, and of a ſtrong ſtomacke to digeſt without any trouble all the filth of the Romiſh Church, ſticketh not at the matter, but plainely affirmeth, that *other good mens merits may ſteed them that want ſome of their owne*; and ſaith, that it *may be deduced out of an hundred places of Scripture*; whereas of that hundred there is not ſo much as one that will yeeld him ground of any ſuch deduction. For as for that which he alledgeth out of the firſt Commandement, that *God ſheweth mercy vnto thouſands in them that loue him, and keepe his commandements*; how he ſhould draw mans merit from thence, where God profeſſeth onely his mercie both to the fathers and the children,

dren, no wise man can easily conceiue. It is true, that God sometimes in the Scriptures is said for one mans sake to shew mercie to another, it is neuer said, that it is for one mãs merits that he shewes mercy to another, but only for his own loue & promise sake. Thus do the people of God somtimes make mentiõ of [f] *Abraham, Isaac, Iacob,* [g] *Dauid,* not as to begge of God for their merits sake, but as to vrge God with his couenant and promise, that hee made vnto these, who shewed all that mercy and loue vnto their seed, [h] *because he would keepe the oath which he had sworne vnto their fathers.* And surely seeing it was only for his mercies sake, that he respected the fathers themselues, it is vnlikely that for the fathers merits he shold respect the children. [i] *Abraham* (saith *Oecumenius*) *was not by his workes worthy of the benefits of God: hee had nothing at all, not any shew of workes, to the benefits that hee receiued of God; but was accounted worthy thereof by faith onely.* The cause of all was that which *Moses* said; [k] *He loued thy fathers, therefore he chose their seede.* And what, was it for their merits that he loued them? What merits had *Abraham,* when God called him from [l] *seruing other gods,* and euen at the first gaue him [m] an absolute promise of all that mercy & goodnesse that hee shewed him afterwards? It was therefore that which the same *Moses* also saith: [n] *He set his loue vpon you, because he loued you:* there was nothing to moue him to loue but onely loue. To which purpose he saith by the Prophet *Malachy:* [o] *Was not Esau Iacobs brother? yet I loued Iacob & hated Esau;* signifying, that there was no cause in *Iacob* himselfe, why God should loue him more then *Esau;* and yet of meere grace and fauour he vouchsafed so to do. Here is nothing then to serue *M. Bishops* turne, that one mans merits may steed another, because these had no merits to steed themselues, but whatsoeuer they were, they were of mercy, and it was onely mercie wherby God bound himselfe to shew mercy to others for their sakes. And well we may wonder, but that these are impudent and shamelesse men, that they should dare so farre to aduance the righteousnesse of man, as to make him able, not only to merit and deserue at Gods hands for himselfe, but also for other men. Wherein their peruersnesse and iniquity is so much the greater, for that they attribute and yeeld that to the spotted & vnperfect workes and righteousnesse of man, which they wickedly deny to the immaculate and most perfect merits and righteousnesse of

[f] Deut. 9. 27.
[g] Psal. 132. 10.
[h] Deu. 7. 8. & 9. 5
[i] Oecumen. in Rõ. cap. 4. Siquis illũ demonstrare nitatur per opera dignũ fuisse, &c. *Vides quod nihil omnino habeat, ne vestigium quidẽ operum ad huiusmodi beneficia quæ ipse à Deo accepit. Vnde ergo hic dignus habitus est? Ex sola fide.*
[k] Deut. 4. 37.
[l] Iosuah 24. 2.
[m] Gen. 12. 1, 2.
[n] Deut. 7. 7, 8.
[o] Mal. 1. 2.

the

the Sonne of God. For they hold it absurd, that the righteousnesse and merits of Christ should be imputed and accounted vnto vs; & yet they blush not to say, that a man may haue merits of his owne, sufficient for himselfe, and an ouerplus beside to bee reckened and imputed vnto others to supply their want. The Popes dispensation can apply the merits of one man to another, but the faith of Christ cannot apply to vs the merits of Christ. The Scripture teacheth the imputation of Christs merits, and that they deny: it denieth the imputing of other mens merits, and that they affirme against the Scripture. Which, beside that it teacheth an vnsufficiencie and imperfection in all the workes of men, and therefore bereaueth them of all power and ability of merit, doth also giue vs to vnderstand, that [p] *the righteousnesse of the righteous shall bee vpon himselfe*, and therefore shall not be reckened to another: that [q] *euerie man shall giue account of himselfe vnto God*, and therefore shall haue nothing to doe with other mens accounts; that [r] *euerie man shall beare his owne burthen*, and therefore shall not haue his burthen borne by others: that the [s] *wise virgins* haue no superfluitie of oyle which they may impart to them that want. [t] *Who hath by his death released another mans death*, saith *Tertullian*, *but onely the Sonne of God? If thou be a sinner, how should the oile of thy little candle bee sufficient both for thee and me?* He spake it truly in the proposition, though he misapplied it to a wrong conclusion: and therefore *Leo* Bishop of Rome saith in like sort, that [u] *the iust haue receiued crownes, they haue giuen none; and of the fortitude of the faithfull are grown examples of patience, not gifts of righteousnesse; neither hath any man by his end paied the debt of another man, seeing it is only our Lord Iesus Christ amongst the sonnes of men, in whom all haue beene crucified, dead, buried, and raised againe.* Farre was hee from that blasphemous doctrine, which now preuaileth in the Church of Rome, that some men haue merits and gifts of righteousnesse, whereby to bee helpefull to other men. But yet *M. Bishop* telleth vs, that they that receiue this helpe must bee such as *want but some of their owne.* For wee must vnderstand belike, that heauen is merited by peece-meale. Some merit it quarter part, and some the one halfe, and some all, and some more then all. By which meanes it must come to passe, that some, who haue merits to keepe them from hell, and yet not enow to bring them to heauen, must hang betwixt heauen and hell, vnlesse the Vicar of Rome

p Ezech. 18:20.
q Rom. 14:12.
r Gal. 6:5.
s Mat 25:9.
t Tertull de pudicit. Quis alienam mortem suâ soluit ni solus Dei filius? si peccatores, quomodo oleum faculæ tuæ sufficere & tibi & mihi poterit?
u Leo Epist. 81. Acceperunt quippe iusti, non dederunt coronas; & de fortitudine fidelium exempla nata sunt patientiæ, non dona iustitiæ, &c. nec alterius quisquam debitum suo fine persoluit, cùm inter filios hominum vnus solus Dominus noster Iesus Christus extiterit, in quo omnes crucifixi, &c.

Rome will doe them a fauour, out of his treasurie to endow them with the merits of some of the Saints, or some of the Saints themselues wil vndertake out of their superfluities to make vp that that is wanting vnto them. This secret the Diuines of Rhemes vttered, that [z] *if wee haue not our owne merits, wee shall not bee holpen by other mens deserts at the day of iudgement*: leauing it to be vnderstod, that if we haue merits of our owne, wee may then looke for the supply thereof in other mens merits Wretched hypocrites, impostors, & deluders of ignorant men, who [y] *when all hands shall faile* (*as Hierome* saith) *because no worke shall bee found worthy of the iustice of God, and no man liuing shal be iustified in the sight of God*, yet make men beleeue, that some shall haue that superabundance of righteousnesse and merits, as that they shall be able to releeue them that want merits of their owne. Is this the honor that they do to Christ, to thrust him out of place when we haue greatest need of him, and to make men trust to the imaginary merits of sinfull men? And what, shall not Christ be as ready then to succour vs as the Saints? or shall his merits bee found vnsufficient to deliuer vs? or what should be the cause, that we shold thus be put ouer one to be helped by another, rather thē by him that is the helper and Sauiour of vs all? But this is the horrible apostasie and darknesse of the Romish Synagogue, which hath made no end of multiplying her fornications, wherewith shee hath bewitched men, and made them to doate vpon strange and monstrous fancies, and hidden from them the true knowledge of Iesus Christ, by which they should be saued.

[z] *Rhem. Testam. Annot. Mat.* 25. 8.

[y] *Hieron in Esa. lib. 6. cap. 14. Cum dies iudicij venerit, dissolventur omnes manus, quia nullum opus dignum Dei iustitia reperietur & non iustificabitur, &c.*

As touching the third instance, it shall not heere be need to say much. We affirme that they derogate frō the merit of Christs passion, and do make him but a Parti-Christ, in that they deny him to haue made a full and perfect satisfaction for our sins, & say, that he hath left vs in part to satisfie for the same. *M. Bishop* saith, that in the reseruing of temporall satisfaction, he hath shewed himselfe *a most prudent redeemer*; as if his foolish braines were the measure of the wisdome of Christ, or the selfe-will conceipts of carnall men were to determine the power and effect of the crosse of Christ. Christ is [z] *the Lambe of God that taketh away the sinne of the world*, and if he *take away* our sinnes, then they remaine not by vs to be satisfied for. The forgiuenesse of our sins by Christ is [a] *the not imputing of our sinnes*; but how are they *not imputed*, if satisfaction there-

[z] 1 Iohn 1. 29.

[a] 2. Cor. 5. 20.

of

of be required? This falsehood of theirs hee gloseth with a truth. We must be made [b] *like vnto Christ*, as members to the head. We must [c] *suffer with Christ, that we may raigne with Christ.* But what of this? We deny not, but that by suffering, when God will and as he will, we must be conformed to Christ our head: but wee deny this conformity in suffering to be any satisfaction for our sinnes. Which as it hath no shew of proofe out of those words of the Apostle, so, that it cannot otherwise be prooued, shall be shewed, God willing, in the question concerning that matter.

b Rom. 8. 29.
c 2. Tim. 2. 12.

In the third and last instance *M. Perkins* chargeth them, that though they be content to acknowledge Christ to be a Mediator of intercession, yet they reserue to his mother the blessed Virgin, their *Queene of heauen*, an authority to rule him and commaund him there. This *M. Bishop* thinketh to be a matter of *simplicity* in *M. Perkins*, that he should thinke it a magnifying of Christ to acknowledge Christ *a Mediator of intercession*, whereas they *make him*, as he telleth vs, *no Mediator of intercession, but a redeemer*. Now in this we see his honest mind, that he is loth that *M. Perkins* should say better of them then they deserue, and will haue vs to know that they bereaue Christ of one speciall part of his office and Priesthood, which is to *make intercession for vs*. The reason is, because they must haue a dignity belonging to the Saints, and therefore because they know not how to doe it otherwise, they diuide the office of Christs mediatiō, & reseruing vnto Christ, though not that wholy neither, to be our *Mediator of redemption*, do assigne the mediatorship of *intercession* to the Saints. And yet the Scripture expresly telleth vs, that Christ [d] *sitteth at the right hand of God to make intercession for vs*; that [e] *hee is able perfectly to saue them that come vnto God by him, seeing hee euer liueth to make intercession for them.* Thus S. *Austen* saith, that [f] *Christ prayeth for vs, and prayeth in vs, and is prayed vnto of vs. He prayeth for vs as our Priest: he prayeth in vs as our head; he is prayed vnto of vs as our God.* Yea hee saith, that [g] *in heauen Christ alone of them that haue beene partakers of flesh maketh intercession for vs*, insomuch that [h] *if S. Iohn should haue said, If any man sinne, ye haue me for an aduocate with the father, I make intercession for your sinnes, he should haue bene holden not for a Disciple of Christ, but rather for Antichrist himselfe.* Thus hee doth not onely make Christ our Mediator of intercession, but also the

d Rom. 8. 24.
e Heb. 7. 25.
f *Aug. in Psal. 85. Orat pro nobis, et orat in nobis, & oratur a nobis: Orat pro nobis vt sacerdos noster, orat in nobis vt caput nostrum, oratur à nobis vt Deus noster.*
g *In Psal. 64. Solus ibi ex his qui carnem gestauerunt interpellat pro nobis.*
h *Cont. epist. Parmen. li. 2. ca. 8. Si Ioannes ita diceret, si quis peccauerit, aduocatum habemus apud patrem ego exoro pro peccatis vestris, quis eū sicut discipulum Christi & non sicut Antichristum ipsum susciperetur?*

onely

onely Mediator of intercession, and therefore condemneth *M. Bishop* of wicked sacriledg, that taketh away this part of his office from him, to bestow it vpon the Saints. But this praier and intercession Christ performeth not now by vocall words, as in the time of his humiliation here vpon the earth, neither doth hee infinitelie busie himselfe by renewing his petitions & supplications to the Father when wee call vpon him, but his intercession for vs is his [j] *appearing in the sight of God for vs*; whereby as [k] *the sacrifice which hee offered vpon the crosse is no lesse effectuall now, then it was the day when water and bloud issued out of his wounded side, still requiring our salvation as the reward of his obedience*, euen so the voice of his intercession in the daies of his flesh, still soundeth aloud in the eares of God, and by the power thereof, both wee our selues, and all our praiers and requests are most effectuallie recommended to his mercy. Therefore wee doe not now pray to him to pray for vs, but wee [l] *aske the father in his name*, as hee himselfe hath taught vs, presenting still the memory of the merit and intercession that hee hath performed for vs. And because [m] *the father hath giuen him power to execute iudgement, euen as hee is the sonne of man*, euen [n] *all power both in heauen and earth, and hath made all things subiect vnder his feete, and setts him as head (and ruler) ouer all things, to the behoofe of his Church*, therefore we do not onely pray to the Father, but wee pray to him also, euen as he is the *sonne of man*; wee do not onely [p] *offer or present him to his Father eies, but we present him also to his owne eies*, that for that intercessions sake which [q] *in himselfe as man hee made to himselfe as God*, hee will both God and man bee mercifull vnto vs. As for *M. Bishops* Atlas aplyfie all or rather Nestorian like and heretical conceipte *of singling out the humanity of Christ from his diuinity, to make it an intercessor for vs*, let him burie it in his owne braines wheresoeuer it was bred, but for vs we know, that to pray to Christ to be our intercessor to the father, according vnto that he promiseth, [r] *I will pray the Father, and hee shall giue you another Comforter*, doth no more require the singling or separating of the manhood from the Godhead, then do all other his workes for our reconciliation vnto God, in which the vnio of two natures doth alwaies giue force and strength to that which is properlie acted but in one.

[j] Heb. 9. 24.
[k] Cyprian. ser. de bapt. Christi & manifestat. Trinit.
[l] Iohn 16. 23.
[m] Iohn 5. 27.
[n] Mat. 28. 18.
[o] Ephes. 1. 22.
[p] Bernard. super. Missus est. Hom. 3. Ipsum oculis patru ipsum offeramus & sistamus.
[q] August. in Psal. 34. In meipso humanitas & in meipso diuinitatem interpellat.
[r] Iohn 14. 16.

M. B. I-

W. BISHOP.

*And to come to your grieuous complaint*, that withall his Nother must be Queene of heauen, and by right of a mother command him there: *Who can sufficiently marueil at their vnnaturall grosse gates, who take it for a disgrace to the Sonne, to aduance his owne good Mother? or else who well in his wits, considering Christs bounty to strangers and his enemies, will not be perswaded, that on his best beloued mother, he did bestow his most speciall fauours? For hauing taken flesh of her, hauing suckt her breasts, and receiued his nurture and education of her in his tender yeares, and being as well followed of her, as of any other, Is it possible that he should not be as good to her, as to others. vnto whom he was not at all beholding? Againe, the very place of a mother, requiring preheminence before all seruants and subiects, of what dignity soeuer: doth not the right rule of reason lead vs to thinke, that Christ the fountaine of all wisdome, replenished the blessed virgine* Marie *his deere Mother with such grace as should make her fit for that place? it lying in his hands, and free choice to doe it. And therefore is shee truely termed of holy and learned Antiquity,* Our Lady and Queene, exalted aboue all quires of Angels. *That which you impute vnto vs further, that she must in the right of a mother command her Sonne, is no doctrine of the Romish Church, nor said in all her seruice: wee say,* Shew thy selfe to be a mother: *but it is not added, by commanding thy Sonne: that is your glosse, which is accursed, because it corrupteth the text, for it followeth in that place,* Sumat per te preces, &c. *Present our prayers to him, that vouchsafed to be borne of thee, for vs. If any priuate person by meditation, piercing more profoundly into the mutuall loue and affection, of such a Sonne towards so worthy a Mother, doe deeme her prayers as forcible in kindnesse as if they were Commandements, and in that sense call them Commandements, according to the French phrase.* Vos priers me sont des commandements, *that may be done without derogation to Christs supreame dignity, and with high commendation of his tender affection, vnto his reuerend and best beloued mother. Wherefore to conclude this Epistle, if there be no weightier cause then this by you heere produced, why you and your adherents do not reconcile your selues vnto the Church of Rome: you may shortly (by Gods grace) become new men. For we are so farre off, from making our Sauiour Christ a Pseudochrist, or from drawing one iote of excellency from*

*from his soueraigne power, merits, or dignity: that wee in the very points by you put downe, do much more magnifie him then you do. For in maintaining the authority by him imparted vnto his deputies, our spirituall Magistrates, & of their merits and satisfaction: We first say, that these his seruants prerogatiues bee his free gifts, of meere grace bestowed on whom hee pleaseth, which is no small praise of his great liberalitie: And withall affirme, that there is an infinite difference betweene his owne power, merits, and satisfaction, and ours: wherein his Soueraigne honour is preserued entire to himselfe without any comparison. Now you make Christs authority so base, his merits and satisfaction so meane, that if he impart any degree of them vnto his seruants, hee loseth the honour of all from himselfe. Whereupon it followeth inuincibly, if you vnfainedly seeke* Christ Iesus *his true honour, and will esteeme of his diuine gifts worthily, you must hold out no longer, but vnite your selues in these necessarie heads of Religion vnto the Catholike Church of Rome, which so highly exalteth him, both in his owne excellencie, and in his singular gifts to his subiects.*

## R. Abbot.

Heere *M. Bishop* tellerh vs a goodly and a faire tale out of their old wiues deuotions, and sheweth himselfe more absurdlie and grossely superstitious, then were almost to be imagined in a learned man. It is strange to vs, that the Euangelists and Apostles were not acquainted with this high point of religion, or if they were acquainted with it, that none of them should haue regard to recommend it to the Church. Surelie, if they had been of the Romish religion that now is, they would neuer haue done the Virgin *Mary* that exceeding great wrong: but because they were not so, because their care was, that God onely should bee aduanced according to his word, therefore *M. Bishop* thinketh them *vnnaturall grosse pates, in taking it to be a disgrace to the Sonne, to aduance his owne good Mother.* As for vs, we honour the blessed Virgine so farre as God hath giuen vs warrant so to do. Wee acknowledge her a most excellent instrument of the grace of God, and most highly blessed aboue all other, in that God by her would bring him into the world, that should be a blessing to all other. But yet we say, that this was a blessing onelie according to the flesh, it was no spirituall and heauenly blef-

blessing, and because spirituall blessings are greater then carnal, we hold the Virgin *Mary* to haue beene greater by that that shee had according to the spirit, then by the honour that was done her according to the flesh. Therefore *S Austin* saith, that [a] *Mary was more blessed by receiuing the faith of Christ, then by conceiuing the flesh of Christ. Her neerenesse to Christ in beeing his mother had nothing bootted her, had shee not more happily borne him in her heart then in her wombe.* This our Sauiour himself confirmeth in the Gospell, when being told as hee was preaching, that his *mother and brethren* were desirous to speake with him, answered as with indignation, [b] *Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? He that doth the will of my Father which is in heauen, hee is my brother and sister and mother.* [c] *My mother and brethren are these which heare the word of God and keepe it:* [d] *He maketh these other of the greater worth*, saith *Tertullian*, and *shewet h that the hearing of Gods word is a thing to bee preferred* aboue beeing the mother and brethren of Christ. [e] *Hee transferreth the names of kindred to them, whom hee rather iudgeth to be most neere vnto him, because of faith, whom hee putteth in place of the other, not as more truly his mother and his brethren, but as beeing of greater worth.* So againe, when a woman amidst the companie cried out: [f] *Blessed is the wombe that bare thee, and the pappes that gaue thee sucke*, to withdraw the minds of men from carnal fancies, he answereth, *Yea rather, blessed are they that heare the word of God and keepe it*; [g] *Not denying the wombe and pappes of his mother* (saith *Tertullian* againe) *but signifying them to bee more happy, that doe heare the word of God.* This happinesse and heauenly bounty *Mary* was also partaker of, but hee considereth her respectiuelie onelie vnder the title of the *mother of Christ*. Therefore more plainely *S. Austin* deliuereth Christs answer: [h] *My mother whom ye call blessed, is therefore blessed, because shee keepeth the word of God, not because the word became flesh in her.* *Epiphanius* further obserueth, that when Christ another time saith vnto his mother: *Woman what haue I to doe with thee? mine houre is not yet come*: He therefore [i] *called her woman, that none might thinke too highlie of the holy Virgin*; as prophecying *what should come to passe in the earth by Sects and heresies, that none admiring her* (saith he) *should fall into this heresie and the dotages thereof*: speaking there

[a] *Augustin. de sanct. Virg. cap. 3 Beatior Maria percipiendo fidem Christi, quàm concipiendo carnem Christi, &c. Materna propinquitas nihil Mariæ profuisset, nisi Christum fœlicius corde quam carne gestasset.*
[b] Mat. 12. 48. Mar. 3. 33.
[c] Luk. 8. 21.
[d] *Tertul. de carne Christi. Potiores facit alios, & meritum prælationis ostendit, audientiã fœlicem verbi.*
[e] *Idem aduer. Marcion. lib. 4. Transtulit nomina sanguinis in illos quos magis proximos pro fide iudicaret, &c. Non vt veriores substituit, sed vt digniores.*
[f] Luk. 11. 28.
[g] *Tertul. de carne Christi. Non matris vterum, & vbera negans, sed fœliciores designans, qui verbum Dei audiũt.*
[h] *Augustin. in Ioan. tract. 10. Mater mea quæ appellastis fœlicẽ, inde fœlix quia verbum Dei custodiuit, non quia in illa verbum Caro factũ est.*
[i] *Epiphan. her. 79. Collyridian. Quo non putarent alii qui me is eximiam esse sanctam Virginem, mulierem eam appellauit, velut prophetans quæ futura essent in terra sectarum et hæreseon gratia, vt ne aliqui nimium admirati sanctam, in hanc hæresin eiusque deliramenta dilaberentur.*

as touching the hereſy of the Collyridians, who ſet vp the image of the Virgin *Mary*, and thereto offered (*Collyridem*) a cake in the honour of her, and thereof they had their name. As touching all this blind deuotion which the Papiſts haue renewed to the full, hee telleth vs, that [k] *it is a toy, and an old wiues fable*: and asketh as wee do, [l] *What Scripture hath told vs any thing hereof?* And that we may vnderſtand how leudly *M. Biſhop* belieth antiquitie, in ſaying, that *Antiquity tearmed the Virgin Mary, Our Lady and Queene exalted abone all quires of Angels*, he reaſoneth thus againſt that hereſie: [m] *Which of the Prophets hath taught, that any man is to be worſhipped? much leſſe a woman.* And againe, [n] *If God will not haue the Angels to bee worſhipped, how much more will hee not haue the daughter of Anna to be worſhipped?* And againe; [o] *Let no man worſhip Mary; I ſay, not a woman, no not a man: this myſtery belongeth vnto God, the Angels receiue not any ſuch glory.* And againe, as touching the name of the Queene of heauen, he addeth, [p] *Let not theſe women trouble the world: let them not ſay, wee do honour to the Queene of heauen.* Wee ſee how farre *Epiphanius* was from the conceipt of thoſe ſuperſtitious fooleries, which *M. Biſhop* here ſo ſolemnely diſcourſeth vnto vs. We ſee how the Church of Rome walketh iuſt in the path and ſteppes of theſe heretikes, which were of old condemned by the Church. They argued, as *M. Biſhop* here full ſimplie doth, from the *vnright rule of crooked reaſon*: ſhe was his *beſt beloued mother, hee tooke fleſh of her, he ſucked her breſts*, ſurelie he would beſtow vpon her *his ſpeciall fauoures*; hee would without doubt doe more for her, then for ſtrangers, to whom he was not at all beholding: he would *repleniſh her with ſuch grace as ſhould make her fit for that place* which hee neuer gaue her. Theſe are fantaſticall preſumptions of ſillie doting women, and blind ignorant doltrels: they haue no ſauour at all of the ſpirite of God. They might vpon theſe grounds argue for the brethren and coſins of Chriſt, and conceiue, as the mother of *Iames* and *Iohn* did, that beeing his kinſmen, they ſhould be more reſpected then others, and as they were neerer him in bloud, ſo ſhould be preferred in dignity & place, and therefore ſhould [q] *ſit one at his right hand, & the other on his left hand in his kingdome.* But the kingdome of Chriſt is not adminiſtred by ſuch fancies, neither do carnall titles ſerue to giue preferment there. And as touching the bleſſed Virgin, *Epiphanius* further againſt ſuch conceipts obſerueth, that

[k] *Ibid. Eſt ludibrium tota res, & anicularum fabula.*

[l] *Quæ Scriptura de hoc narrauit.*

[m] *Quis Prophetarum præcepit hominem adorari, nedum mulierem?*

[n] *Si Angelos adorari nonuult, quanto magis eam quæ genita eſt ab Anna?*

[o] *Mariam nemo adoret, non dico mulierem, imo neque virum. Deo debetur hoc myſterium, neque Angeli capiunt talem glorificationem.*

[p] *Ne turbent orbem terrarum: ne dicant, honoremus reginam cœli.*

[q] Mat. 20. 21.

Christ [r] *permitted her not to baptize, gaue her not power to blesse his disciples, did not appoint her to raigne or rule in the earth: but her only sanctification was, to be made worthy of his kingdome.* It was therefore an hereticall deuice, to make her *Queene of heauen:* and it hath bene since one of the forgeries of Antichrist, to attribute vnto her a power and authority to *command the Sonne of God.* But *M. Bishop* telleth vs, that *this is no doctrine of the Romane Church, nor found in all her seruice,* yet knoweth well enough, that this was the doctrine of the Romane Church, and commonly found in all her seruice. Harlots that haue little shame, yet blush at some things: and the harlot of Rome though of an iron forehead, yet saw some things to bee so grossely blasphemous and inexcusable, as that shee could not for shame but remoue them out of the Church, when question began to be made of them. Such was that praier concerning *Thomas Becket,* which before I mentioned in the answer to the Epistle:

*Super Thomæ sanguinem quem pro te impendit,*
*Fac nos Christe scandere quò Thomas ascendit.*

That is:

*By the blood of Thomas which for thee he did spend,*
*Make vs, O Christ, to clime whither Thomas did ascende.*

Which praier was found in all their porteſſes, though now it bee token out. So they were wont also very solemnely to sing throughout the whole Church of Rome:

*Iube filio, fœlix puerpera*
*Iure matris impera*
*Redemptori, &c.*
*Bid thy Sonne, O blessed Mother,*
*By mothers right command our Redeemer.*

This *Durœus* the Iesuit acknowledgeth [s] *ex libris Ritualibus, out of their bookes of rites and ceremonies,* by which their Church seruice was directed. Yea *M. Bishop* himselfe verie well knoweth, that the words are not to bee denied, and therfore as *Durœus* doth, so doth hee also make a fauourable construction thereof, that the Author of that praier, *deemed the Virgins praiers to her Sonne, to bee as forcible in kindnesse, as if they were commandements, & in that sense called them commandements.* Thus as *M. Harding* vnder a colour of [t] *spirituall sporting and dalliance*; so these men vnder *opinion of kindnesse,* doe labour to hide open blasphemie and spirituall idolatrie. They sticke

not

r Ibid. Non permisit ipsi dare baptismum, non benedicere discipulis, non in terra imperare iussit, sed & solam ipsâ sanctificationem esse dignam factam esse regno ipsius.

s Durœus contr. Whitaker. lib. 1. Ad libros Rituales confugit, ex quibus obsoleta quædam corradit.

t Harding. Confut. of the Apology. part. 2.

not to speake apparantly to the derogation of the Sonne of God, and then turne it to matter of iest, like him of whom *Solomon* speaketh, who "*faining himselfe mad, casteth firebrands, arrowes and deadly tooles, and then saith, Am not I in sport?* But how ill their sporting construction fitteth with the humour of those times, let it appeare by another hymne of theirs, which will not bee so answered:

u Pro. 26. 18. 19.

x *Gaude matrona cælica; exultando magnifica*
*Deum tuum salutarem qui te fecit singularem.*
*Tu ancillam Iesu Christi te vocare voluisti:*
*Sed vt docet lex divina, tu ipsius es Domina.*
*Nam ius habet & ratio, matrem præesse filio.*
*Ergo ora supplicitèr & præcipe sublimiter,*
*Vt nos in mundi vespera ad regna ducat suprema.*

That is to say:

*Be glad O matron heauenly, and with reioicing magnifie*
*Thy God, thy Sauior who thee hath singled out in dignity.*
*The handmaiden of Iesus Christ, thy selfe to call thou wast content:*
*But thou his Lady mistresse art, as teacheth Gods commandement.*
*For right and reason doth require, the mother be aboue the Sonne:*
*Pray therefore as a suppliant, and command as a higher one,*
*That in the end of this worlds daies,*
*He bring vs to his heauenly ioies.*

x *Histor. secundum chorum Augustens. de commemor: Virginis Mariæ.*

Heere is then *right* and *reason*, and *Gods commandement* to approue and iustifie, that the Virgin *Mary* as the *Mother* should haue power ouer her sonne, and authority to command him. And to no other purpose foundeth that which *M. Bishop* acknowledgeth, as being yet in their vse, y *Monstra te esse matrem*; *Shew thy selfe to be a mother.* Hee saith it is not added, *by commanding thy sonne*, but hee should haue told vs how otherwise it should be meant; because wee know not, nor can conceiue in what meaning they should request her to shew her selfe to bee his mother, but onely vpon opinion of some motherly superioritie, and authoritie to command him. For as for that which he saith followeth in that place, *Sumat per te preces qui pro nobis natus tulit esse tuus*; *Let him by thee receiue our praiers, who for vs yeelded to be thy sonne*; it giueth vs no light at all to the contrarie, but that shee should shew her motherly command, by causing him to accept the praiers that are made vnto

y *In hymn. Ecclesiastic.*

him; which he ſeeing, tranſlateth the words falſly, *Preſent our prai-ers vnto him, &c.* And thus the common people were perſwaded by them and ſpecially women, that they had better hope and rea-dier acceſſe to God, and more aſſured ſafetie by our Lady, then they had by the *Sonne* of God. And no maruell, when they lifted her vp into the ſeate of Chriſt, and inueſted her in their publike ſeruice, with all the titles of mercy and grace that are proper vnto him. Now therefore, *M. Biſhop*, there is cauſe ſufficient for vs to for-beare to bee reconciled to the Church of Rome, which vnder pre-tence of magnifying Chriſt, hath put the Pope and the Virgin *Ma-rie*, and the reſt of the Saints in the place of Chriſt, and colloureth her Antichriſtian preſumptions, and vſurpations vnder the feigned title of the gifts of Chriſt. You deuiſe what you liſt, and fill the Church with your abhominations, and vſe the name of Chriſt as a cloake to couer your filthineſſe and ſhame. If they came naked in their owne likeneſſe, all men would deteſt them, and deteſt you for perſwading them; therefore it is the policie of the whore of Baby-lon to offer the [z] *filthineſſe of her fornications in the golden cup* of the name of Chriſt, that the glorie of the cup may bewitch them, not to ſuſpect any poiſon to bee contained therein. As for vs, wee e-ſteeme of the power, merits and ſatisfaction of Chriſt, as hee him-ſelfe hath taught vs to eſteeme; we aſſume no part or parcell thereof to our ſelues, becauſe by the letters patents of his Goſpell we haue no warrant ſo to doe. Becauſe then wee vnfeignedly ſeeke the true honour of Ieſus Chriſt, and cannot brooke the diſhonour that is done vnto him in the Church of Rome, vnder the counterfeit termes of his *diuine gifts*, wee make choice to hearken to the voice of God, [a] *Come out of her, my people, and be not partakers of her ſinnes, leſt ye be partakers of her plagues.*

z Apoc. 17. 4.

a Apoc. 18. 4.

## M. BISHOPS ANSWER TO M. PERKINS

### Preface to the Reader.

*VPon your preface to the Reader I will not ſtand, becauſe it toucheth no point of controuerſie: let it be declared in your next, what you meane*, when you deſire your reformed Catholike to hold the ſame neceſſarie heads of Religion with the Roman Church: *for if the Ro-man Church doth erre in the matter of faith, and iuſtification; in the*

*number*

*number and vertue of the Sacraments; in the bookes and interpretation of the word of God; if she raze the foundation, and make Christ a Pseudo-christ, and an Idol; to omit twentie other errors in substantiall points of faith, as in this your small discourse you would perswade: there will remaine verie few necessarie heads of Religion for them to agree in. And be you well assured, that you are so wide from winning Catholikes by this your worke, to a better liking of your Religion, that you haue taken the high-way, to leade them to a farre greater dislike of it; by teaching, that in so many materiall points it differeth so farre from theirs. For all Catholikes hold for most assured, that which the most ancient, learned and holy Doctor* Athanasius *in his Creed deliuereth in the 2. verse:* Which Catholike faith vnlesse euery man obserue wholly and inuiolably (*not omitting, or shrinking from any one article of it*) without doubt he shall perish euerlastingly. *If S. Basil that reuerend and blessed Father of the Church, doth hold it the duty of euerie good Christian, rather to loose his life, then to condescend to the alteration of any one syllable in matter of faith: you may be sure that we Catholikes can-* Theod. 4. hist. cap. 17.
*not but cary a very base conceipt of your doctrine; who go about vnder the ouer-worne and threed-bare cloake of reformation, to deface and corrupt the purer and greater part of Christian Religion: specially when they shall perceiue the most points of your pretended reformation, to be nothing else but old rotten condemned heresies, now scoured vp and furbished, and so in shew made more saleable vnto the vnskilfull, as in this treatise shall be proued in euerie Chapter.*

R. ABBOT.

YOur demaund, *M. Bishop*, is alreadie satisfied before. *M. Perkins* by those *necessarie heads of Religion*, vnderstandeth such general grounds as stand vnquestioned betwixt vs and the Romish Church, which for the matters handled hee commonly setteth downe by the name of *our consents* in the entring of euery question. There are some maine points of doctrine to which the Church of Rome subscribeth as well as we. The Reformed Catholike is still to hold those, though hee depart from the corruptions and abhominations, to the maintenance whereof the same Church of Rome doth wickedly misapply them. As for his *winning of Catholikes to the liking of our Religion*, I assure my selfe that you *M. Bishop* your selfe, and your friend of good intelligence and iudge-

ment, were iealous and doubtfull thereof. His plaine debating of the points in question, laying open the absurditie of Poperie, and clearing the doctrine on our part, from those lies and slaunders wherewith in corners you labour to deprave it, might seeme verie likely to drawe many to the knowledge and approbation of the truth. It should seeme, there was some sore, for that both you and your friend were so careful to apply a plaister; but your plaister by the grace of God wil make your sore a great deale worse, when men shal further see, how sincerely he hath dealt to deliuer truth out of the word of God and doctrine of the ancient Church, and what base geere you haue brought as *the marrow and pith of many large volumes*, for the contradicting and oppugning of it. The more and greater the points are of difference betwixt the Church of Rome and vs, the more doth it concerne your Catholikes, if they tender their owne saluation to looke into them, which if they doe, they will cease to thinke basely of our religion, and will begin to honour it, and imbrace it as the truth of God. They will see, that there is in it a true reformation indeed, a iust departure from the horrible idolatries and superstitions of the Romish Synagogue, and it shall grieue them that they haue so long dishonoured God, by holding fellowship with him who hath no true fellowship with Iesus Christ. That you thinke basely thereof, *M. Bishop*, we wonder not. He that doateth vpon a harlot, is wont to scorne and thinke basely of honest matrons. The Scribes and Pharisees thought basely of our Sauiour Christ: no maruell if you doe the like of the Gospell of Christ, who liue and thriue by traditions as they did. As for *old rotten condemned heresies*, how silly a man you haue shewed your selfe in the obiecting thereof, it hath appeared partly already in the answere of your Epistle, and shall appeare further, God willing, in the answere of your booke, and wee will expect hereafter, that you learne more wit, then to babble and prate of heresies, you know not your selfe what.

THE

## THE THEAME OF M. PERKINS Prologue.

*And I heard another voyce from heauen ſay, Go out of her my people, that you be not partakers of her ſinnes, and receiue not of her plagues.* Reuel. 18. 3.

## M. BISHOPS ANSWERE TO M. *Perkins* Prologue. Sect. 1.

THe learned know it to be a fault, to make that the entrie vnto our diſcourſe, which may as properly fit him, that pleadeth againſt vs: but to vſe that for our poeme, which in true ſenſe hath nothing for vs, may rather beareth ſtrongly for our aduerſarie, muſt needs argue great want of iudgement: Such is the ſentence aboue cited out of S. Iohn by M. Perkins: for it being truely vnderſtood, is ſo farre off from terrifying any one from the Catholike Roman Church, as it doth vehemently exhort all to flie vnto it, by forſaking their wicked companie that are banded againſt it. For by the purple Harlot in that place is ſignified (as ſhall be proued preſently) the Roman Empire, as then it was, the ſeate of Idols, and with moſt bloudie ſlaughter perſecuting Chriſts Saints: Thoſe of the Church of Rome being as neareſt vnto it, ſo moſt ſubiect to that ſacrilegious butcherie. Wherefore that voyce which S. Iohn heard ſay, Go out of her my people, that you be not partakers of her ſinnes, &c. can haue none other meaning, then that all they who deſire to be Gods people, muſt ſeparate themſelues in faith and manners from them, who hate and perſecute the Roman Church, as did then, the Heathen Emperours, and now do all Heretikes: Vnleſſe they will be partakers of their ſinnes, and conſequently of their plagues. This ſhall yet appeare more plainely in the examination of the Chapter. Where I will deale friendly with my aduerſarie, and aduantage him all that I can; that all being giuen him, which is any way probable, it may appeare more euidently, how little he hath to any purpoſe out of this place of the Apocalypſe, whereof all Proteſtants vaunt and bragge ſo much both in their bookes and pulpits. Well then, I will admit that in the 17. and 18. Chapters of the Reuelation by the whore of Babylon, is vnderſtood the Roman ſtate and regiment: which in lawfull diſputations, they are not

*Exordium Commune.*

*able to proue: the most iudicious Doctor* S. Augustine, *and diuers others of the ancient fathers, with the learned troupe of latter interpreters, expounding it of the whole corps and societie of the wicked. And as for the seauen hils on the which they lay their foundation, they are not to be taken litterally: the Angell of God in the very text it selfe interpreting the seuen heads of the beast, to bee aswell seuen Kings, as seuen hils. But this notwithstanding to helpe you forward, I will grant it you, because some good writers haue so taken it: and therefore omit as impertinent that which you say in proofe of it. What can you inferre hereunto? Marry that the Roman Church is that whore of Babylon. Faire and soft good Sir, how proue you that? Thus. The whore of Babylon is a state of the Roman regiment,* ergo *the Roman Church is the whore of Babylon. What forme of arguing call you me this? By the like sophistication, you may proue that* Romulus *and* Remus *were the* purple Harlot, *which to affirme were ridiculous; or (which is impious) that the most Christian Emperours,* Constantine *and* Theodosius, *were the whore of Babylon, because these held also the state of the Roman Empire and regiment. To make short, the feeble force of this reason lieth in this: that they who hold the state, and gouerne in the same kingdome, must needs be of like affection in religion; which if it were necessarie, then did Queene* Marie *of blessed memorie, and her sister* Elizabeth *carrie the same minds towards the true Catholike faith, because they sate in the same chaire of estate, and ruled in the same kingdome. See I pray you what a shamefull cauill this is, to raise such outcries vpon. A simple Logician would blush to argue in the parmes so loosely: and yet they that take vpon them to controle the learnedst in the world, often fall into such open fallacies. Well then, admitting the* purple Harlot *to signifie the Roman state, we do say that the state of Rome must be taken as it was then, when these words were spoken of it; that is, Pagan, Idolatrous, and a hot persecutor of Christians. Such it had bene a little before vnder that bloudie tyrant* Nero, *and then was vnder* Domitian: *which we confirme by the authoritie of them who expound this passage of the Roman state. The commentarie on the Apocalypse, vnder* S. Ambrose *name saith,* The great whore sometime doth signifie Rome, specially which at that time when the Apostle wrote this, did persecute the Church of God: but otherwise, doth signifie the whole citie of the Diuell. *And* S. Ierome *who applieth the place to Rome, affirmeth,* that she had before his dayes blotted out that blasphemie

In Cap. 17.

Libr. 2. cont. Iouin.

written

written in her forehead, *becauſe then the ſtate was Chriſtiã, which before had been Heathen: ſo that vnto the partie Pagan, and not vnto the Church of God, hee aſcribeth theſe works of the wicked Harlot: which alſe the very text it ſelfe doth conuince: for it hath,* That ſhe was drunk with the bloud of the Martyrs of Ieſus. *Now the Church of Rome had not then by the confeſſion of all men, drawne any bloud of Chriſts Saints, but in teſtimonie of his truth, had powred out abundance of her beſt bloud. Wherefore it is moſt manifeſt, that the harlot could not ſignifie the Church of Rome, ſo pure and free from ſlaughter: but the Roman Empire, which was then full gorged, with that moſt innocent and holy bloud. Againe, that whoore is expounded,* To bee a citie which had kingdome, ouer the Kings of the earth *But the Church of Rome had then no kingdom ouer the earth, or any temporall dominion at all, but the Romane Emperours had ſuch ſouereigne commandement ouer manie Kings: wherefore it muſt be vnderſtood of them, and not of the Church. Now to take* kingdome *not properlie for temporall ſouereignty, but for ſpirituall iuriſdiction, as ſome ſhifters do, is to fly without any warrant, from the natiue ſignification of the word, vnto the phantaſticall and voluntarie imagination. And whereas* M. Perkins *ſaith,* pag. 5. *that* Eccleſiaſticall Rome in reſpect of ſtate, princely dominion, and cruelty againſt the Saints, is all one with the heatheniſh Empire: *hee both ſeeke to deceiue, & is greatlie deceiued: he would deceiue, in that he doth apply words ſpoken of Rome, aboue* 1500. *yeeres ago, vnto Rome as it is at this day: and yet if that were granted him, he erreth fouly in euerie one of his particles. For firſt, touching princely dominion, the Romane Empire held then, all Italy, all France, all Spaine, all England, a great parte of Germanie, of Aſia, and alſo of Africke. hauing their Proconſuls, and other principall Officers in all thoſe Countries, drawing an hundred thouſand millions in money, and many other commodities out of them: Wherefore in princely dominion, and magnificall ſtate, it ſurmounted Eccleſiaſticall Rome (which hath not temporall dominion ouer the one halfe of that one kingdome of Italie) more then an hundred degrees. And as for perſecution, the Empire ſlue, and cauſed to be ſlaine, more Saints of God in one yeere, then the Church of Rome hath done, of reprobates and obſtinate heretikes, in* 1600. *yeeres.*

Ver. 6.

Ver. 18.

R. Ab.

R. ABBOT.

VVEe ſee that *M. Biſhop* hath ſome skill in Oratory, but it ſeemeth he hath learned one precept aboue the reſt of *extenuation* or *diminution*, to giue ſemblance of making light of his aduerſaries arguments, and not to be touched therewith, when notwithſtanding hee is galled with them, and wounded at the heart. Of this leſſon hee maketh good vſe throughout his whole booke; but here in the beginning hauing his wits yet freſh, hee goeth somewhat beyond it, and will make his Reader beleeue, that that text of the Apocalypſe, which *M. Perkins* propounded for the matter of his Prologue, *Goe out of her my people, &c.* is ſo farre from making againſt them, as that it is an aduertiſment to all men to forſake the ſocietie and fellowſhippe of all them that ſhew themſelues aduerſaries to the Church of Rome. The Apoſtle telleth vs, [a] *There muſt be hereſies, that they which are approued may be knowne.* Becauſe *there muſt bee hereſies*, there muſt bee *heretickes*, men giuen vp to reprobate ſenſe, obſtinate and wilfull in their wicked fancies, euen then when they are [b] *condemned in themſelues.* Otherwiſe ſuch is the light and euidence of Scripture, in directing that admonition as a cauеat againſt the Church of Rome, at leaſtwiſe to euerie mans eies and ſight, there is that probabilitie thereof, as that a man would not beleeue, but that the handling of this point ſhould haue made *M. Biſhop* to tremble and feare, and to ſurceaſe from going any further in the reſt, ſpecially ſeeing that for the ſafegard of his minion of Rome, hee is faine to goe ſo directly contrarie to the euidence that ſtood againſt him. Yet wee ſee how gloriouſly hee carieth himſelfe heere in the beginning, and maketh ſhew of great largeſſe, and of giuing his aduerſarie all the aduantage he can. But let him remember what *Solomon* ſaith, [c] *A man that boaſteth of falſe liberality, is like clouds and wind without raine.* His words ſhew more courage then wiſedome, and hee giueth his aduerſarie no aduantage at all, but what hee muſt haue whether hee will or not. The queſtion is, whether *Babylon* and *the whore of Babylon* mentioned in the Reuelation, be to bee vnderſtood of Rome or not? Hee alledgeth out of *Auſtin*, and ſome other ancient (though not indeed ſo ancient) writers, and out of *a learned troupe of later interpreters*, as it pleaſeth him to terme them, that by *Babylon* is vnderſtood *the whole*

[a] 1. Cor. 11. 19.

[b] Tit. 3. 11.

[c] Prou. 25. 14.

*corps*

*corps and ſocietie of the wicked.* But his maiſter *Bellarmine* hauing mentioned that expoſition for anſwer to our obiection, leaueth it, and ſaith, [d] *It may be ſayd, and in my iudgement better, that by the harlot it vnderſtood Rome.* So had he before ſayd, that S. *Iohn* [e] *declareth, that the woman is the citie that ſitteth vpon ſeuen hils, that is* (ſaith he) *Rome.* The very cleere light of the truth made him to confeſſe, that in the deſcription of the *whore of Babylon* Rome muſt neceſſarily bee vnderſtood; he muſt ſhift otherwiſe as hee might, but he ſaw that to denie this would bee no ſhift. Yea and the expoſition that *M. Biſhop* bringeth, maketh nothing to the contrarie. For although we vnderſtand that Babylon do import *the whole corps and ſociety of the wicked*, yet we are alſo to vnderſtand, that this *corps and ſocietie* hath a head, from whence the name is deriued to the whole body, and therefore the notification of the body, ſpecially being a body ſo confuſed, muſt needs be by the deſcription of the head. The affirming I ſay of Babylon to be *the whole corps and ſocietie of the wicked*, doth not exclude Rome from being meant by *the whore of Babylon*, becauſe *the head* is neceſſarily implied in *the whole body*, and Rome is deſcribed and ſet forth vnto vs, as being *the head* of that ſocietie. And that *the head* is here properly meant, is inuincibly manifeſt, becauſe the ſpeech is here of [f] *her that maketh all nations drunk with her fornications*, and is therefore to be diſtinguiſhed from *the body of the wicked of all nations*, which are made drunke by her. But for declaring of this point *S. Auſtin* in ſundrie places diuideth the whole body of mankind by [g] two cities, *Babylon* and *Hieruſalem*, comprehending vnder the name of *Babylon* all that liue according to the fleſh, and vnder the name of *Hieruſalem*, all that liue according to the ſpirit. [h] *The loue of the world maketh Babylon*, and the citizens thereof, *The loue of God maketh Hieruſalem* and the citizens thereof. This earthly citie being the whole corps and ſociety of the wicked, taketh the name of it from *Babylon* the great Citie of Aſſyria, which was for the time the principall part thereof. [i] *In Aſſyria* (ſaith *S. Auſtin*) *preuailed the dominion of the wicked citie; the head thereof was Babylon, whoſe name, that is, Confuſion, ſitteth the citie of earthly kind and diſpoſition.* That Babylon wholy ſauoured of the fleſh, affecting altogether the ſtate and kingdome of this world, full of abhominable idolatrie, couetouſneſſe, pride, crueltie, vncleane and filthie luſt, perſecution and hatred

d *Bellarm. de Antichriſt. cap. 13. ſecundò dicit eſſe, & meo iudicio melius per mer-ticem intelligi Romam.*

e *Ibid cap. 2. Explicat mulierem eſſe vrbem magnam quæ ſedet ſuper ſeptem colles, id eſt Romam.*

f *Apoc. 14. 8. & 17. 2.*

g *Auguſt. in Pſal. 26. & 61.*

h *Idem in Pſal. 64. Duas iſtius ciuitates duo faciunt amores: Hieruſalem facit amor dei; Babyloniam facit amor ſeculi.*

i *De ciuit. dei. li. 16. cap. 17. In Aſſyria prætualuerat dominatus impiæ ciuitatis: huius caput erat Babylon illa, cuius originem ciuitatis nomen aptiſſimum eſt, id eſt confuſio.*

hatred towards the people of God, whom it held a long time in ſubiection and bondage to it ſelfe. Now as that Babylon being the moſt auncient ſtate of earthly minded men, was the head of that companie and ſocietie of the wicked, not becauſe all vniuerſally were outwardly ſubiect vnto it, but becauſe all were ioyned inwardly in conformitie of affection with it; ſo Rome aroſe vp afterward to be another head of the ſame bodie, [k] *as it were another Babylon in the Weſt*, as *S. Auſtine* ſpeaketh. [l] *Babylon*, ſaith he, *was as it were a firſt Rome, and Rome is as it were a ſecond Babylon, and as the daughter of the former Babylon.* It was Babylon then euen from the firſt original of it, though as did Babylon, ſo Rome alſo ſhould in the latter ſtates therof grow to be in higher degree of confuſion then it was in the beginning. All this the holy Ghoſt moſt plainly confirmeth in the deſcription deliuered by [m] *S. Iohn*. Firſt, it is to be obſerued, that S. *Iohn* according to the example of the Prophet *Daniel*, doth by the tearme of [n] *a beaſt* import ſome earthly kingdome, ſtate, and gouernment, therefore named *a beaſt*, to ſignifie the ſame to be led wholly with beaſtly & carnall affection, to thoſe things that concerne the fleſh, and ſauour of the fleſh. Secondly, by [o] *a woman, a harlot*, he noteth a citie, which is the place and pallace of ſuch a ſtate, giuen to fornications, both ſpiritual by idolatry, and corporal by luxurioufneſſe, wantonneſſe & filthie luſt, which *ſitteth* and hath aduancement by the preheminence of that kingdome, ſtate, and gouernment. Thus the Angell plainely diſtinguiſheth *the woman* and *the beaſt*, when he ſaith: [p] *I will ſhew thee the myſterie of the woman, and of the beaſt that beareth her*, of which *S. Iohn* had ſaid before, [q] *I ſaw a woman ſit vpon a ſcarlet coloured beaſt*. Albeit, we are ſo to take this diſtinction, as that withall we vnderſtand that the ſame is not alwaies preciſely obſerued, but that *the woman* and *the beaſt* are vſed ſometimes indifferently for the ſame, and either of them to ſignifie the whole. Now of *the woman* the Angell ſaith, [r] *The woman which thou ſaweſt, is the great citie, which raigneth ouer the kings of the earth*. Againe, ſhe is ſaid [ſ] *to ſit vpon many waters*, which (ſaith the Angel) [t] *are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues*. But there was no citie that raigned ouer the kings of the earth, and ouer thoſe many nations and peoples, but onely the citie of Rome. Rome therefore is the woman that is there meant. This appeareth further by that he noteth of the

k *Ibid. Roma condita velut altera in Occidente Babylonia.*
l *Ibid lib. 18. cap. 2. Babylonia quaſi prima Roma: Ipſa Roma quaſi ſecunda Babylonia eſt: & cap. 22. velut prioris filia Babylonis.*
m Apoc. 13. & 17. &c.
n Dan. 7. &c.
o Cap. 17. 1. 3.
p Ver. 7.
q Ver. 3.
r Ver. 18.
ſ Ver. 1.
t Ver. 15.

ſituation

situation of this citie vpon the *seuen heads of the beast*, which (saith the Angel) *are* [u] *seuen mountaines or hils, vpon which the woman sitteth. M. Bishop* telleth vs, that *those seuen hils* are not to *be taken literally*; but that is a very witlesse shift. The Angell by way of exposition deliuereth, that by *seuen heads* are ment *seuen hils*, & wee must take it vpon *M. Bishops* word, that by *seuen heads* are not meant *seuen hils*, but somewhat else, but what, hee cannot tell himselfe. What an absurd toy is this, that the Angell so expounding it, wee should bee sent to him againe, to know what hee meaneth by *seuen hils*? But this toucheth them to the quicke, because the citie of Rome is famous for seuen hils, for which *Tertullian* calleth the people of Rome [x] *the native or home-borne people of seuen hils*; whereof they had their [y] *septimontium*, which was [z] *a festiuall day in the moneth of December, vpon which day they performed sacrifices and deuotions vpon those seuen hils*: and *was so named* (as *Varro* obserueth) [a] *of those seuen hils vpon which the city stood*. Seeing then there is no city in the world to which this mark of *seuen hils* can bee applied but onely the citie of Rome, they haue no way to excuse Rome from beeing *the whore of Babylon* here described, but onely by saying, that those *hils* are not properly to bee vnderstood; thereby bewraying the miserie of their cause to euery man that doth not wilfully yeeld himself to bee blinded by them. The Angell further expounded those [b] *seuen heads* to signifie *seuen kings, of which fiue are fallen*, saith he, *one is, and another is not yet come*: that is, saith the Rhemish Diuines, though they said it before they were aware, [c] *fiue were before Christ, one present, and one to come*. Whereby they crosse that absurd shift of theirs vsed in the place which we haue heere in hand, that [d] *seuen is a mystical number signifying vniuersally all of that sort whereof he speaketh, and that the seuen heads, hils, or kingdoms, are all the kingdomes of the world, persecuting the Christians, beeing heads and mountaines*, say they, *for their height in dignity aboue others*. For if the *seuen heads* bee taken in that generalitie of construction, then there i no place left for this diuision of *fiue before Christ, one present, & one to come*, because the meaning must be, *all that are past, all that are present, and all that are to come*. The other exposition which they bring, is as vaine and ridiculous as that. For as they reckon [e] *fiue empires, kingdoms, or states, that were persecutors of Gods people* before the time of Christ, as *of Egypt, Canaan, Babylon*, the *Persians*, and *Greeks*:

[u] Ver. 9.

[x] *Tertul. Apol. cap. 35 ipsos Quirites, ipsam vernaculam septem collium plebem consenio.*

[y] *Idem de idololat.*

[z] *Ibid in Annot. Ren. Laur. Septimontium dies festus appellatur mense Decembri, &c. quòd in septē montibus fierent sacra.*

[a] *Varro de ling. Latin. lib. 5. Dies septimontium nominatus est ab his septem montibus in quibus vrbs sita est.*

[b] Ver. 9.

[c] *Rhem. Test. Ann. Apoc. 13. 3.*

[d] *Annot. Apoc. 17. 9.*

[e] *Ibid.*

*Greekes:* ſo they may reckō many mores as cruelly minded towards them as theſe were, the Philiſtines, the Amalekites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Iſmaelites, the Edomites, the Aſſyrians: and becauſe there are ſo many more then *fiue*, therefore they cannot accord with the ſumme here, where there are but *fiue*. Yea and the text plainely reiecteth this manner of account, becauſe the *ſeuen heads* here ſpoken of, are *heads* of one *beaſt*, and therefore cannot be applied to diuers ſtates. But by one of theſe *heads* or *kings*, it ſhall appeare what all the reſt are. Of the king that was in the time of Chriſt and of *S. Iohn*, there is no queſtion but that it was the Emperour of Rome, who was in a manner the king of the world, and therefore [f] *gaue foorth commandement* a little before the birth of Chriſt, *that all the world ſhould be taxed*. There is no other king to be ſpoken of at that time, but onely this king. Seeing then that the ſixt *king* is *head* of the Romane ſtate, and all the *ſeuen kings* are *heads* of one and the ſame ſtate, it muſt needes bee, that thoſe *fiue kings*, which were before Chriſt, were alſo *heads* of the Romane ſtate. Now in this ſixt *head*, we ſee that the name of *king* is not vnderſtood of them onely who haue the verie title of kings, but of ſuch as haue the place and authority of kings, that is, the higheſt and ſupreme gouernment of the ſtate. And as the ſixt head or king was not onely one man, but the whole ſucceſſion of the Emperors, ſo we muſt vnderſtand, that the other *fiue heads* or *kings*, were not fiue ſeuerall men, but fiue ſeuerall titles and ſtates of the higheſt gouernours of the ſtate. And fully ſo many wee find in the Romane gouernment before the Emperours and the time of Chriſt; which were *kings* ſo called, *Conſuls*, *Decemuirs*, *Tribunes*, *Dictators*, euery of which for their times ſucceſſiuely, were the ſupreme Officers in the Empire and kingdome of the Romans. Seeing then that this cannot be iuſtified in any other ſtate or citie, but onely in the citie of Rome, it is heereby manifeſt againe, that Rome muſt be the Babylon here intended by *S. Iohn*. Furthermore this *beaſt* is deſcribed alſo to haue [g] *ten hornes*, and thoſe ten hornes are expounded to bee [h] *tenne kings*, which ſhall grow out of the *beaſt*, that is, out of the ſame ſtate or kingdome. Now there was no other ſtate, but only the ſtate of the Romane Empire, whence thoſe *kings* might ariſe, yea and *S. Ierome* witneſſeth, that [i] *all Eccleſiaſticall Writers haue deliuered, that thoſe ten kings ſhall diuide amongſt them the Romane Empire*. Therefore

*Bellar.*

f Luk. 1. 2.

g Verſ. 3.
h Verſ. 12.
i Hieron. in Da. 7. Dicamus quod omnes Scriptores eccleſiaſtici tradiderunt, &c. decem futuros reges qui orbem Romanum inter ſe diuidant.

*Bellarmine* alſo confeſſeth, that [k] *the tenne kings ſhall ariſe out of the Romane Empire, but ſhall be no Emperours of Rome, euen as the hornes grow out of the beaſt, but yet are not the beaſt.* If then it be certaine, as it is moſt certaine, and cannot be denied, that the ſtate of Rome is it whence thoſe ten kings muſt grow, how can we make doubt, but that the State of Rome is it, which is here ſet foorth vnto vs vnder the name of Babylō? To ſay nothing, that there was no other ſtate or gouernment to which it can ſo rightlie bee applied, that it was [l] *drunken with the bloud of Saints, and of the Martyrs of Ieſus Chriſt.* The deſcription fitteth ſo liuely and apparantlie, as that the auncient Fathers *Tertullian* and *Hierom* haue made vndoubted conſtruction thereof concerning the citie of Rome. [m] *Babylon with S. Iohn* (ſaith *Tertullian*) *carieth the figure of the citie of Rome.* [n] *They thinke* (ſaith *Hierome*) *that the Romane Empire ſhall be eternall, whereupon according to the Reuelation of S. Iohn, in the forehead of the purple harlot is written a name of blaſphemie, that is, Rome euerlaſting.* In another place ſpeaking of his dwelling in Rome, he ſaith: *When I remained in Babylon, and was an inhabitant of the purple harlot, and liued after the law or faſhion of the Romanes.* And againe, writing to *Marcella* in the name of *Paula* and *Euſtochium*, to perſwade her to come from Rom to Bethlehem, vſeth argument thereof from that which in the Reuelation is written concerning Rome: [o] *Read* (ſaith he) *the Reuelation of S. Iohn, and behold what is there ſaid of the purple harlot, and the blaſphemie written in her forehead, of the ſeuen hils and many waters, and of the end of Babylon*: and thereupon applieth to it the ſentence heere prefixed, *Goe out of her my people, ſaith the Lord, &c.* Of which place *Ludouicus Viues* giueth this obſeruation, that [p] *Hierome writing to Marcella, thinketh that there is no other Babylon deſcribed by Iohn in the Reuelation, but only the citie of Rome.* In another place alſo ſpeaking namelie to the citie of Rome, he ſaith: [q] *Our Sauiour in the Reuelation hath threatned a curſe vnto thee.* Thus they conceiued that all that is ſaid of Babylon, of the purple harlot, of the name of blaſphemie, of the ſeuen hils, of the many waters, of the curſe threatned to Babylon, and the finall deſtruction of it, to be wholy vnderſtod of the citie of Rome. We wil therefore take nothing here of *M. Biſhops* curteſie and gift, but by

k *Bellarm. de Antichriſt. cap. 5. Orientur quidem ex Romano imperio, ſed non erunt Romani Imperatores: ſicut cornua ipſa oriuntur ex beſtia, ſed beſtiæ ipſe non ſunt.*

l Ver. 6.

m *Tertull. contra Iudæos, & lib. 3. contra Marcion. Babylon apud Ioannem noſtrum Romanæ vrbis figuram ſortitur.*

n *Hieron. ad Algaſ. q. 11. Romanum imperium æternum putant. Vnde in fronte purpuratæ meretricis ſecundū Apocalypſin Ioannis ſcriptum eſt nomen blaſphemiæ hoc eſt, Roma æterna.*

* *Idem præfat. in lib Didymi de Sp. ſancto. Cùm in Babylone verſarer, & purpuratæ meretricis eſſē colonus, & inter Quiritum vtuerem.*

o *Idem ad Marcellam. Lege Apocalypſin Ioannis, & quid de muliere purpurata, & ſcripta in eius fronte blaſphemia, ſæpiē mentibus, aquis multis, & Babylonijs cantetur exitus contuere.*

p *Ludo. Viues in Auguſt. de ciuit. Dei. lib. 18. cap. 22. Hieronymus ad Marcellam ſcribens non aliam exiſtimat deſcribi à Ioanne in Apocalypſi Babylonem, quàm vrbem Romam.*

q *Hieron. ad Ioann. lib. 2. Malè ſibi Romanus ſaluator in Apocalypſi comminatus eſt.*

the

the very light of the text we will wrest it from him whether he will or not. Now this *M. Perkins* setteth downe indefinitely, that *the whore of Babylon is the state or regiment of a people that are the inhabitants of Rome, and appertaine thereto:* he concludeth not, *ergo, the Romane Church is the whore of Babylon,* but inferreth, that by other consequence afterwards; and *M. Bishop* shall see, God willing, that there is sufficient to be said for proofe thereof. But whereas he saith, that of that assertion it followeth that *Romulus* and *Remus were the purple harlot,* he is much deceiued therin, because *the state or regiment of a people that are the inhabitants of Rome,* cannot be strained to import *all people* that are the inhabitants of Rome. Yet wee must let him vnderstand, that *Romulus* was the first founder of Babylon, and in him was the beginning of the first of those *seuen heads of the beast,* because he was the first king of Rome. For Rome was Babylon euen from the first originall of it, as before I noted out of *Austin,* and as appeareth in that it is described to haue *seuen heads,* and therefore must bee Babylon, not vnder one or two onely, but vnder all those heads, though wee indeed most commonly speake thereof, onely in respect of Antichrist, which is the seuenth head. So was she also from the beginning *a purple harlot,* beeing founded in bloud and parricide, as *S. Austin* obserueth, by [r] *Romulus* his slaughter of his brother *Remus,* that he might be king alone: established by [t] rauishment of virgins & maides, allured thither vnder pretence of sports and plaies: increased by continuall slaughter and bloudshed, to that huge greatnesse which it attained vnto: though the name of *purple harlot* bee more specially giuen in respect of shedding the bloud of the martyrs of Christ, and of the filthines of Antichrist, wherein he should go beyond all other that had gone before him. As for *Constantine, Theodosius,* and some other such like godly and Christian Emperours, though they were heads of her that is *the whore of Babylon,* yet it followeth not that they were *the whore of Babylon, or the purple harlot,* because it is not necessarie that simply all in that succession should bee of the same affection. For euen amidst the ranke and succession of idolatrous heathen Emperours, when *M. Bishop* denieth not but that Rome was Babylon, there was [t] *Philip* the Emperour, a godly and Christian Prince, so deuoted to religion, as that hee submitted himselfe to the censure of the Church. Yea and *Valerian* the Emperour in the beginning of his

[r] *August. de ciu. Dei lib. 15. cap. 5.*
[t] *Tit. Liu. Dec. 1. lib. 1.*
[t] *Euseb. hist. lib. 4. cap. 33.*

his raigne was so well affected to Christian religion, as that his *Court was full of godly and deuout persons, and was become a Church of God.* Therefore though *Constantine* and *Theodosius* were godly princes, yet Rome might still continue Babylon, both by the remainder of those impieties that were before, and by the seedes of that defection that was to come, which soone began to bee sowed, and mightily to grow there. What soeuer may be alledged of Rome for that time, it is easily to be vnderstood, that some small *interregnum*, as I may tearme it, and intermission of beastly and Babylonish corruption and confusion, could not take away the nature and name of that which it had been so long before, and was soone after to be againe. And indeed a small time it was, that Rome continued in the hands of those religious and godly Princes. Necessarie it was in respect of those things that were afterward to bee fulfilled, that Christian religion should publikely be established and aduanced there, which could not bee, but that the Emperours and Princes themselues must be Professors of Christian faith. But the chiefe seate of the Empire beeing by *Constantine* translated to Constantinople in the East, Rome within a while fell into the possession of other Lords. For about threescore and thirteene yeares after the death of *Constantine* (in which time also for some part thereof it had beene holden by *Constantius* and *Valentinian* the second *Arian* heretickes, by *Iulian* the Apostata, and *Maximus* the tyrant) it was wholly taken by the Gothes out of the Emperours hands, and so continued as [x] *Bellarmine* also confesseth, vnto the time of *Iustinian* the Emperour, which was about the space of an hundred and foureteene yeares: yea and soone after, it was distressed and taken againe, and the Westerne Empire wholly ouerthrowne, the prouidence of God by this confusion giuing way by little and little to the Bishop of *Rome* to take vpon him, as afterwards he did, to bee the seuenth head of the *Romane* state. Now then we hope *M. Bishop* can see, that we haue no meaning to argue in that sort, that *they are of like affection in religion who gouerne the same kingdome*, nay we are so far from arguing in that sort, as that wee rather confesse, that they who both are properly *heads of the whore of Babylon*, may yet bee diuers in religion, as were the heathen Empetours that were of old, from the Popes that are now. Yet vpon his loose imagination he censureth vs, that *with such fallacies wee take vpon vs to controule*

[u] *Idem lib 7. c. 9. Tota illius aula referta erat pijs, & ecclesia dicta.*

[x] *Bellarm. de Antichristo cap. 5. Valens, Arcadius, Theodosius super, & alij eorum successores vsque ad Iustinianum omnes Roma carnerunt.*

*the learneſt in the world*, of which whoſoeuer they are, wee are ſure that he is none, nor doe bold him a fit man to iudge who they are. But *M. Biſhop*, let vs not contend who are *the beſt learned*. You know what we are wont to ſay, that *the greateſt Clerkes be not alwaies the wiſeſt men*. *Solomon* telleth you, [y] *Seeſt thou a man wiſe in his owne conceipt? there is more hope of a foole then of him*. Thinke humbly of your learning, and it will haply ſerue you the better to learne the truth. As for our learning, thankes bee to God, it hath done you that ſorrow, that you haue no cauſe to brag of yours, onely looſers muſt haue their words, and hee can doe little, that cannot talke.

y Prou. 26. 12.

But now he telleth vs, that *admitting the purple harlot to ſignifie the Romane ſtate, yet the ſtate of Rome muſt bee taken as it was then when theſe words were ſpoken of it, that is, pagan, idolatrous, and a hot perſecutor of Chriſtians*. Here is all that he hath to ſay, and if this bee nothing, there is no remedy but Rome muſt be Babylon, the Pope Antichriſt, and then what ſhall become of him? Now we deny not but that Rome was the *purple harlot* vnder thoſe heathen Emperors, but we denie that in the falling of thoſe Emperors, ſhe ſhould thenceforth ceaſe to bee *the purple harlot*. For *the purple harlot* deſcribed by *S. Iohn*, was ſo to be vnder *ſeuen heads*, of which by *S. Iohns* account, the Emperour was but the ſixt. Sith then that Rome was *the purple harlot* vnder the Emperour, which was the ſixt head, it followeth that there remained after the Emperour a *ſeuenth head* of the Romane ſtate, vnder which Rome was to continue to be *the purple harlot*. That Babylon ſpoken of by *S. Iohn*, muſt bee poſſeſſed by a *beaſt* as head thereof, in the time of thoſe *ten kings* to which the empire ſhall bee diuided, which [z] *ſhall giue their power and authoritie to the ſame beaſt*. There was no ſuch diuiſion of the Empire, nor any ſuch tenne Kings in the time of thoſe heathen Emperours. Therefore ſith Rome was Babylon vnder the heathen Emperours, it muſt continue to be Babylon after them. Yea that Babylon muſt be deſtroyed, with that deſtruction which *S. Iohn* deſcribeth at large in the 18. Chapter. But Rome was not ſo deſtroyed in the time of thoſe heathen Emperours. Therefore it abideth ſtill vnder the name of Babylon, expecting the time of that deſtruction. To bee ſhort, it is without all controuerſie, and *D. Sanders* confeſſeth it, that [a] *Babylon mentioned by Saint Iohn, is the ſeate and citie of Antichriſt*.

z Apoc. 17. 13.

a *Sander. viſib. Eccleſ. Monarch. lib. 8. demonſtr. de Ancich. 8. Ioannes in Apocalypſi dicit, Reg. terræ cum Babylone (quæ ſedes & ciuitas Antichriſti eſt) fornicatos eſſe.*

*chriſt.* Becauſe therefore that Rome is that *Babylon* whereof *Saint Iohn* ſpeaketh, Rome muſt be the *ſeat and citie of Antichriſt.* Rome was not the *ſeate and citie of Antichriſt* in the time of the heathen Emperours. Therefore it remained afterward ſo to be. It appeareth therefore how vainely theſe men pleaſe themſelues with a ſhadow of an anſwer, that Rome was the *purple harlot* in the time of the heathen Emperours, inaſmuch as thereof it followeth, that ſhee is afterwards alſo the *purple harlot*, becauſe it is apparant, that the *purple harlot* muſt be after the time of thoſe Emperours, and there are not two purple harlots, but onely one. That therefore which *M. Biſhop* alleadgeth vnder the name of *Ambroſe*, is ſo farre from making any thing for him, as that it maketh wholly againſt him, becauſe it prooueth, that *Rome was that great whore at that time, when the Apoſtle did write this.* So doth that alſo of *Hierome*, becauſe it ſheweth, that it was *Rome that had that blaſphemie written in her forehead.* As for that that he ſaith, that [b] *by the confeſſion of Chriſt, ſhee had blotted out that blaſphemie*, it helpeth *M. Biſhop* nothing. Shee had taken away the imputation thereof for the time, but that eclipſe of the light, or rather of the darkeneſſe of *the beaſt* hindred not, as before was ſaid, but that ſhe might returne to be the ſame that ſhe was before. Yea when preſently after he ſaith, that *Chriſt in the Reuelation had threatened a curſe vnto her*, and in his Epiſtle to *Marcella* hath applyed to her, that which is ſaid *of the deſtruction of Babylon*, as we haue ſeene before, hee giueth vs plainely to vnderſtand, that his words yeeld no exception, but that Rome might ſtill bee Babylon, becauſe that *curſe and deſtruction* but vnder the name of Babylon, could not befall vnto her. But *M. Biſhop* hath yet ſome fooliſh reaſons to perſwade vs, that theſe things cannot be meant of the *Church of Rome.* Firſt, *the purple harlot was then drunke with the blood of the Martyrs, but the Church of Rome had not then drawne blood of any.* Abſurd ſhifter, that will thus goe about to delude the vnheedie and ignorant Reader. Who would thinke him in his wits to argue thus, that the Church of Rome now cannot bee the *purple harlot*, becauſe the Church of Rome that then was, had ſhedde no bloud of any Martyr? The Church of Rome then had not that *headſhip*, wherein ſhee ſhould be the *purple harlot.* Shee was afterwards to be *the purple harlot*, when ſhee ſhould be fallen from that that ſhee was then, and ſhould vſurpe the ſtate and dignity of them,

[b] *Hieron. adu. Iouin. lib. 2. Scripſam in fronte blaſphemiam Chriſti confeſſione deleſti.*

by whom the bloud of Martyrs then was spilt, which hauing sithence done by her *head* the Pope, she hath played the butcher of Gods Saints vnder him, aswell as the citie of Rome did before vnder the heathen Emperour. Hereby his other exception falleth in like sort, because we speake not of the Church of Rome that then was, but of that that is growne since, by degenerating from that Church. That Church raigned not ouer the kings of the earth, neither was this latter Church of Rome to raigne ouer kings in that sort as the city of Rome then did: it is sufficient, that by *raigning then ouer the kings of the earth*, the place is described where the *purple harlot* should afterwards sit, though her kingdome were to be of another kind. For that kind of gouernment which was the Empire, was wholy to be abolished, and those *tenne kings* before spoken of, were to arise out of the ruines thereof: but in the place of the Empire another kind of kingdome was to be set vp, in name whereof those *tenne kings* should submit themselues vnto *the beast*. Some title *the beast*, that is, Antichrist must haue whereby to chalenge superioritie ouer those *tenne kings*, which, the title of Imperiall iurisdiction being extinguished, should in likelyhood be *the spirituall iurisdiction*, which hath succeeded in the same place. Which *M. Bishop* would gladly seeme to fasten vpon the first Church of Rome, but alas, that Church knew no such matter; it is a meere vsurpation long after presumed by the Pope. Now by this *spirituall iurisdiction*, he would not deny but that the Pope and Church of Rome hath raigned ouer the kings of the earth; onely he will not haue it to be called *a kingdome*, and thinketh it to be but *shifting* to take it so. Yet *Thomas Aquinas*, who we hope hee will say was no *shifter*, was put to such a shift, as that he was faine to call it not *a kingdome* onely but *an Empire*. Who perceiuing it by constant agreement of all antiquitie, that in the dissolution of the Romane Empire should be the arising of Antichrist, and seeing what the case of the Empire in his time was, asked the question, *How is it that the nations long since are fallen away from the Roman Empire, and yet Antichrist is not come?* Whereto he answereth, *that the Empire is not ceased, but is changed from temporall to spirituall, and that the falling away must not be onely from the temporall Empire, but also from the spirituall.* Where if he had not beene blinded with the doating loue of his mistresse, he would haue seene that Antichrist certainly had

c *Thom. Aquin. in 2. Thes. c. 2. Lect. 1 Quomodo est hoc, quia iam. diu gentes à Romano imperio recesserunt & tamē necdum venit Antichristus? Dicendum est, quòd nondum cessauit, sed est commutatum de temporali in spirituale: & ideo dicendum est quod discessio à Romano imperio debet intelligi non solum à temporali sed à spirituali.*

had beene come, becauſe the certaine and infallible token of the comming of Antichriſt, which was the ruine of the Romane Empire, was apparãtlie fulfilled. For it was the temporall Empire that the ancient fathers ſpake of, they neuer were ſo mad as to dreame of a *ſpirituall empire* to be diuided to ten kings. Of the temporall and ciuill ſtate of the Empire, it was that *Tertullian* ſaid, [d] *The decay of the Roman empire diuided to ten kings, ſhall be the bringing in of Antichriſt.* Of the fulfilling wherof *Eberhaard* Archbiſhop of Iuuauia, aboue three hundred and fifty yeares ago, ſpake thus in an aſſembly of the ſtates of Bauaria: [e] *The maieſtie of the people of Rome, by which the world in times paſt was ruled, is taken out of the earth. The Emperour is a vaine title, and onely a ſhadow. There are ten kings being together, who haue diuided the world, which was ſometimes the Roman empire, not to gouerne but to conſume it. The ten hornes, the Turkes, Greekes, Egyptians, Africans, Spaniards, French, Engliſh, Germans, Sicilians, Italians do poſſeſſe the Roman prouinces, and haue thence worne out the colonies of the Romans. A little horne is growne vp vnder theſe, which hath eies, and a mouth ſpeaking great things.* Thereof *Lyra* alſo ſaith; [f] *All kingdomes, in a manner are gone from the empire of Rome, denying to it ſubiection and payment of tribute; now for manie yeares hath that empire beene without an Emperour.* The empire of Rome then is long ago aboliſhed and come to nought; all *Bellarmines* deuices cannot ſet it vp againe. The Empire that now is, is but a meere title; the name without the thing, and not to bee accounted ſo much as the ſhadow of the Romane empire. Yea what it is, it is the Germane, not the Roman empire; for how ſhould he be called Emperour of Rome, who hath nothing to do in Rome? For the Pope theſe many hundred yeeres hath vſurped Rome, and taken it for his owne, wholy excluding the emperour from thence. [g] *The citie of Rome is ours*, ſaith *Adrian* the fourth, *not the Emperors: our ſeat is at Rome, the Emperours ſeate is at Aquez in Arduenna, which is a wood in France.* [h] *If a man looke to Rome & Italy*, ſaith *Theodoricus*, *it was indeed the ſeate of the ancient empire, but now the Emperour hath nothing there of but a title onely.* So then it is but a mockery now to call him the Roman Emperour; he ſhal vnder the name of an Emperour, be only one of thoſe ten kings, to whom the Empire

d *Tertul. de reſur carnis. Romani imperij abſceſſio in decem reges diuiſa Antichriſtum ſuperducet.*

e *Auentin. Annal lib. 7. Romani maieſtas populis qua olim orbis regebatur, ſublata eſt de terra &c. Imperator vana appellatio & ſola vmbra eſt: Reges decem pariter exiſtunt, qui orbem terræ, Romanum quondam imperium non, ad regendum ſed ad conſumendum partiti ſunt. Decem cornua, Turcæ, Græci, Aegyptij, Afri, Hiſpani, Galli, Angli Germani, Siculi, Itali, Romanas prouincias poſſident, Romanoſque in his excidere colonos. Cornu paruulum ſub his ſuccreuit &c.*

f *Lyra. in 2. Theſſ. cap. 2. A Romano imperio receſſerunt quaſi omnia regna; negantia ea ſubijci & reddi tionem tributi. Iam à multis annis imperium illud caruit imperatore:*

g *Auent. Annal. li. 6. Apulia noſtra cum vrbe Romana eſt, non Imperatoris. Romæ noſtra ſedes eſt, Imperatoris eſt Aquis, &c: ſedes, ſed nunc*

h *Theodoric. à Niem. li. 3. ca. 43. Si ad Romam & Italiam reſpexeris, fuit illa quidem veteris Imperij Imperator nihil de ea habet quàm titulum,*

ſhould be diuided. And hereby the Biſhop of Rome is infallibly knowne to be Antichriſt, becauſe in the fall of the Empire he is riſen vp, and in ſteed of the temporall maieſtie, he hath ſet vp a ſpirituall empire and iuriſdiction of his owne. As for temporall dominion, he needeth not to make him Antichriſt, ſo haue any more but onely the ſtate and territorie of Rome. The Emperor was the ſixt, & Antichriſt (the Empire being diſſolued) muſt be the ſeuenth head of that Romane ſtate, which the Pope hath long time been, and [i] *Bellermine* defendeth him ſo to be. But to make him equall to the heathen Emperours in ſtate and princely dominion, his *ſpirituall iuriſdiction* hath been fully ſufficient; in reſpect wherof [k] *all princes of the world*, as ſaith *Blondus* the Popes ſecretarie, *did honor the Pope as the higheſt God*; and *almoſt all Europe did ſend their tributes to Rome, greater, or at the leaſt equall to the reuenues of ancient times.* Yea, euen out of this realme of England there went greater reuenues to Rome, as [l] *Mathew* of Paris, and others haue noted, then were the reuenues of the Crowne. Therefore a very ſimple euaſion doth *M. Biſhop* vſe, in ſaying, that by *temporall dominion* the Pope is a hundred degrees leſſe then the Emperor was, when as he knoweth, that by his *ſpirituall empire and kingdome*, he hath beene as great, and indeed greater then euer the Emperour was. Now I would haue him to remember what his maiſter *Bellarmine* ſaith, that [m] *Antichriſt ſhalbe the laſt that ſhall hold the Romane empire, and yet without the name of the Romane Emperour.* He would not ſee it, but indeed he doth thereby rightly deſcribe the Pope, who without the name of the Emperour, hath vnder another name of *ſpirituall iuriſdiction*, holden the Empire in ſubiection to himſelfe. This he ſhould do, becauſe the temporall dominion was to bee diuided to ten kings. This he hath done, & hath holden thoſe kings vnder his obedience, and yet theſe men ſtop their eyes, and will not ſee him to be that that indeed he is. As for that which *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *M. Perkins* ſeeketh to deceiue, in that hee applieth to Rome at this day, that which was ſpoken of Rome 1500. yeares ago, hee is therein much deceiued himſelfe, becauſe thoſe things which were ſpoken of Rome 1500. yeares ago, were ſpoken by way of prophecie, to diſcouer Rome vnto vs as it is at this day. His laſt exception is, that *the Empire ſlew more ſaints of God in one yeare, then the Church of Rome hath done of obſtinate heretikes*

in

i *Bellar. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 5. c. 9.*

k *Blond inſtaur. Rom. lib. 3. Omnes principes orbis terrarum pontificem vt ſummum deum honorant & colunt &c. Maiora vel certè pari a priſcorum temporum veſtigiis Europa penè omnis tributa Romam mittit.*

l *Math. Pariſ. in Henr. 3.*

m *Bellarm. de Antichr. cap. 15. Exit Antichriſtus vltimus rex qui tenebit Romanum imperium, tamen ſine nomine Romani Imperatoris.*

in 1600. yeeres. Where after the manner of the persecutors vnder the old Empire, hee calleth them *reprobate and obstinate heretikes*, who were indeed the Saints of God. Of them the Church of Rome slue none at all, vntill by vsurpation of the Pope, shee became the seate and kingdome of Antichrist: but how she hath plaied her part since, it may bee esteemed by that that *Bellarmine* himselfe reporteth, that *by* [n] *eight thousand*, which as *Matthew* of Paris noteth, were the Popes [o] *crosse-marked* souldiers, there were slaine at once *in France a hundred thousand of the Albigenses*, in the time of *Innocentius* the third. *Matthew* Paris againe mentioneth, that not long after, in the time of Pope *Gregorie* the ninth, there were slaine of the in Almaine [p] *an infinite number*, besides a great multitude of them destroied in Spaine. Now these Albigenses, although they will not haue it so taken, were professors of the Gospell, euen of the same faith and religion which we now professe, of whom it were infinite to record, how many hundreds and thousands they haue slaine vnder the names of *Waldenses*, *Leonists*, *Lollards*, *Wicleuists*, *Hussites*, *Hugonots*, and such like. But of later times *Paulus Vergerius*, who himselfe had bin one of the *Inquisition*, & spake vpon good knowledge of his owne, declared that by the same verie *Inquisition* within the space of thirtie yeeres, there had bin martyred [q] a hundred and fifty thousand men and women, onely for the Gospels sake. The French *massacres* and butcheries will not bee forgotten, wherein *M. Stow* mentioneth, that [r] *the slaughters at Vassey, Paris, Sens, Tholouse, Blois, Tours, Angiers, and other places, by credible estimation reported out of France in the yeere 1562. were to the number of a hundred thousand persons, within the space of six moneths.* After which about the space of ten yeeres, followed the slaughter of Bartlemew-tide, most barbarous and cruell, wherein some thirty or fortie thousand were destroied in Paris and other cities of France, within a verie short space, and thereupon great gratulations made at Rome, with processions, and other tokens of publike ioy. Thus they haue made no end of martyring the Saints of Christ, and haue equalled the crueltie of the heathen Empire to the vttermost: and yet this hypocrit beeing instructed by his master *Bellarmine*, and hauing sold himselfe to dub his lies, telleth vs, that his Romane Church, or the Pope the head thereof, hath not at all shed so much bloud, as by the heathen Empire was shed within the compasse of

[n] *Bellar. de notis eccles. cap. 18.*
[o] *Math. Paris. in Ioanne. an. 1213.*
[p] *Idem in Henr. 3. anno 1234.*
[q] *Bale. de. Act. Rom. Pontif. lib. 7. in fine. ex Vergerio.*
[r] *Stowes Annals, anno 1562. in marg.*

one yeere. The bloud that they haue ſhed crieth for reuenge, and they ſhall receiue it in due time.

## W. Bishop.

*Hauing thus proued, that the whore of Babylon, ſignifieth the heathen ſtate of Rome, and not the Eccleſiaſticall: let vs now heare what you ſay againſt it. Marrie, that the diſtinction of the Empire of Rome, and Church of Rome is fooliſh, and coyned of late to ſerue our turne: which to be farre otherwiſe, I proone out of thoſe very Authors, who doe intrepret that harlot to ſignifie Rome; who are neither fooliſh, nor of late daies: you haue heard it before out of S.* Ambroſe *commentaries. And farther, wee gather it out of S.* Hierome, *in the Epiſtle which you cite: for he hauing reſembled Rome vnto Babylon, for the multitude of the wicked, which yet remained in it: poinſeth out a more pure part, ſaying;* There is indeed the holy Church, there are the triumphant monuments of the Apoſtles and Martyrs, there is the true confeſſion of Chriſt, there is the faith praiſed by the Apoſtle, &c. *Bee not there expreſſed two diſtinct parts of Rome? Againe* Tertullian *who liued in the ſecond hundreth yeere, vnder thoſe perſecuting Emperours,*

Lib. cont. Iud. De præſcript. cap. 16.

*ſaith in one place,* that Babylon is a figure of Rome, in reſpect of her proud Empire, and perſecution of the Saints. *And in another,* that Rome was moſt happie for her holie Church, vnto which the Apoſtles with their bloud had poured forth their whole doctrine. *See a plaine diſtinction betweene the Heathen Empire & the holy Church of Rome; which finally may bee gathered out of the expreſſe word of God.*

1. Pet. 5.

Where the Church in Babylon coelect, *is diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of that citie, which was Pagan. You ſay (but without any author) that Babylon there doth not ſignifie Rome, but either a City in Egypt, or Aſſyria: But* Euſebius lib. 2. hiſ. cap. 14. *and* S. Ierome de Eccleſ. ſcript. verſ. Marcus, *with other Authors more worthy of credit, doe expound it of Rome. And you your ſelues take Babylon for Rome, where you thinke that any hold may be taken againſt it, as in the 17. of the Reuelation, but in* S. Peters *Epiſtle they will none of it, becauſe it would proone too plainely, that* S. peter *had beene at Rome.*

R. A-

R. ABBOT.

Wee haue heere a friuolous and idle diſcourſe, onely to giue a mocke to the vnlearned Reader. We doubt not but that there was a difference of old to bee made betwixt the prophane ſtate of the Empire, and the ſtate of the Chriſtian Roman Church, and who would goe about to make any queſtion of that matter? Nay we ſay further, that there is exceeding great difference betwixt the Church of Rome that then was, and the Church of Rome that now is; becauſe the Church of Rome that now is, is become in dominion and princely ſtate like to the Empire that then was. And in this reſpect is it that *M. Perkins* calleth that *a fooliſh diſtinction*, not becauſe it putteth difference betwixt the heathen Empire and the Church that was, but becauſe it diſtinguiſheth to no purpoſe the Empire of Rome that was from the church of Rome that now is, when as the Biſhops *See* is now turned into the Emperours court, and by pretence of *ſpirituall iuriſdiction*, the beaſt that now is, is become the perfect [a] *image of the former beaſt*. Some difference there is in that the Empire was wholy Pagan, and the Church in ſome ſort profeſſeth Chriſt, but in pompe and pride, in filthineſſe, idolatrie and crueltie, the church is now the ſame that the Empire was. He bringeth a place of *Peter* needleſly to prooue his diſtinction, and in that place will needs haue it, that by *Babylon* muſt bee meant Rome. We are well content at his offer to take it ſo; but ſo, as that he muſt remember that beeing once *Babylon*, it ſhould neuer finally ſurceaſe that name vntill it caried Antichriſt for the ſeuenth head thereof, vnder whom the abhominations of it ſhall grow to their full meaſure, that that heauie deſtruction may fall vpon it, which God hath threatned for full vengeance.

[a] Apoc. 13. 12 14.

W. BISHOP.

*Well* M. Perkins *is content in fine, to allow of that diſtinction, of* Heatheniſh and Eccleſiaſticall Rome, *which before hee eſteemed ſo fooliſh: and then will proue, that not the Heatheniſh, but Eccleſiaſticall Rome is reſembled to the* purple Harlot. *See what confidence this man hath in his owne ſhuttle wit, that now wil proue this, and ſhortly after diſproue it: but let vs giue him the hearing. In the* 3. v. *The holy Ghoſt ſaith plainely*, that ſhe hath made all the world drunk with the wine of the wrath of her fornication, *& yet addeth*: that ſhe hath committed for- Cap. 18.

nication

nication with the kings of the earth: *But this cannot be vnderſtood of heathenish Rome, for that left all the kingdomes of the earth vnto their owne religion and idolatries: and did not labour to bring them to worſhip the Romane Gods,* Ergo, *it muſt be vnderſtoode of Papall Rome. I anſwer. The Romane Empire being the head and principall promoter of all kind of Idolatrie, and maintaining, and aduancing them, that moſt vehemently oppoſed themſelues againſt the Chriſtian religion; who with any ſhew of reaſon can deny, but they chiefly committed ſpirituall fornication with the kings of the earth, if not by perſwading them to forſake their owne falſe Gods, which the Pagan Romans worſhip as well as they: yet by encouraging and commanding them to perſeuer in that filthie Idolatry, and to reſiſt, and oppreſſe the Chriſtians whereſoeuer? Neither is that true, that the Romane Emperours did not labour to bring other nations to worſhip new Gods, when* Nero *and* Domitian *would bee worſhipped as Gods, and for feare of* Adrian, *one* Antinous *his ſeruant, was worſhipped as a God of all men: as* Iuſtinus *Martyr teſtifieth in his Apologie to* Antonine. *Theſe words of the text then, agree very well with the Emperours, who both were Idolaters, and the chiefe patrons of Idolatrie: but can in no ſort be applied to the Romane Church, which was then (as the Proteſtants cannot denie) a pure Virgin, and moſt free from all ſpirituall fornication.*

*Euſeb. lib. 4. hiſt cap. 8.*

R. ABBOT.

*M. Perkins* admitteth the diſtinction, without impeachment of any thing that he hath before ſaid. He granteth them that, whereby hee giueth them to vnderſtand that they gaine nothing. The argument which hee alledgeth to proue that *Rome Eccleſiaſticall* is here to be vnderſtood, and not *the heathen Rome*, is verie forcible & ſtrong. For it is true that heathen Rome did not tie other nations, when they had conquered them, to their Gods and rites of religion, but did rather entertaine the religions and Gods of other nations. Which was a thing that *S. Auſtin* derided in them, that [a] *they worſhipped thoſe Gods as their maintainers and defendors, whom they themſelues had ouercome, and vainlie preſumed they could not be conquered, hauing before conquered them by whom they ſhould be defended.* They made not themſelues any rule of religion; they thought it to bee the way to gaine both gods and men, to haue a *Pantheon* for a receptacle of all ſtrange gods, and to faſhion themſelues to the rites and cere-

[a] *Aug. de ciui. dei. lib. 1. cap. 3. Victos deos tam quam præſides ac defenſores colere, &c. Magna vanitate præſumptum non poſſe vinci ſub defenſoribus victis.*

ceremonies of other men. The inſtances that *M. Biſhop* bringeth againſt this, are not to the purpoſe, becauſe they are examples ſingular, and touch not to the perpetuall courſe of the Romane gouernment. *Nero* and *Domitian* commanded themſelues to be worſhipped as Gods, but neither did any ſo before, nor did any afterwards vphold that which they commanded, neither grew any ſuch worſhip vniuerſally or commonly to be receiued. *Adrian* beeing grieued at the loſſe of his paramor *Antinous*, whom he had abuſed to filthie vnnatural luſt, to do him ſome honor being dead whom he could not keepe aliue, named a citie in Egypt of his name [b] *Antinoupolis*, and builded him there a temple, and commanded him there to be worſhipped, but much further the worſhip of *Antinous* preuailed not. Theſe examples are far from anſwering that which is ſaid of the *whore of Babylon*, with ſpeciall reference to the laſt ſtate thereof, for the corruptions whereof ſhe ſhould finally be deſtroyed: [c] *The kings of the earth haue committed fornication with her, and the inhabitants of the earth are drunken with the wine of her fornication.* [d] *All nations haue drunken of the wine of the wrath of her fornications:* [e] *ſhe did corrupt the earth with her fornication.* But theſe things very apparantly agree to the Church of Rome, in which it is fully verified which *S. Hierome* ſaith of Antichriſt, that [f] *he ſhall bring all religion vnder his owne power.* The Pope hath made himſelf the maſter and commander of al religion; what he liſt to approue, muſt be followed; what he diſliketh, muſt be reiected: no man muſt preſume to contrarie that which he ſaith. [g] *We bind them all vniuerſally with a bond of a perpetuall curſe* (ſaith he) *who dare to thinke or teach otherwiſe then the Church of Rome teacheth and obſerueth of the ſacrament of the bodie and blood of Chriſt, or of Baptiſme, or of confeſſion, matrimonie, or other ſacraments of the Church.* [h] *We determine that he ſhall be highly accurſed, whatſoeuer king, or biſhop, or potentate, ſhall thinke that the ſentence of the decrees of the Biſhops of Rome may be violated in any thing, or ſhall ſuffer the ſame ſo to be.* [i] *We denounce, that it is neceſſarie to ſaluation, for euery humane creature to be ſubiect to the Biſhop of Rome.* Vnder this authoritie he hath ſent abroad through the world his Iubilees, his Pardons, his diſpenſations, his

b *Origen. contra Celſum lib. 3.*
c *Apoc. 17. 2.*
d *Cap. 18. 3.*
e *Cap. 19. 2.*
f *Hieron. in Dan. 7. Cunctam religionem ſuæ ſubiiciet poteſtati.*
g *Decretal. de hæret. cap. Ad abolendam. Vniuerſos qui de ſacramento corporis & ſanguinis Domini, vel de baptiſmate, ſeu peccatorum confeſſione, matrimonio, vel reliquis eccleſiaſticis Sacramentis, aliter ſentire aut docere non metuunt quam ſacroſancta Romana Eccleſia prædicat & obſeruat, vinculo perpetui Anathematis innodamus.*
h *25. q. 1: Generali: Conſtitumus vt execrandum anathema ſit, quicunque regum ſeu epiſcoporum, vel potentum decreta Romanorum Pontificum decretorum cenſuram in quoquam crediderit vel permiſerit violandam.*
i *De maior: & obed. cap. Vnam ſanctam. Subeſſe Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronunciamus omnino eſſe de neceſſitate ſalutis.*

Maſſes

Maſſes, his Monkeries, his Relickes, his Agnus Deis, his hallowed beades, his holy water, his holy oyle, and a thouſand ſuch other witchcrafts and ſorceries, and hath enchanted and beſotted the nations to make them doate vpon the opinion of theſe abhominations. I need not amplifie this point, the matter is plain enough, and they themſelues require this obedience to be performed to that filthie beaſt. As for that *M. Biſhop* ſaith of heathen Rome, *incouraging and commanding the nations to perſeuere in their filthie idolatry*, neither doth that ſatisfie the matter, becauſe ſhe could not be properly called *k the mother of thoſe fornications & abhominations* which ſhe found among the nations, and onely incouraged them to perſeuere therin. But the Church of Rome hath either been the deuiſer of her abhominations, or if they haue in any part been deuiſed by others, yet ſhe hath licked all thoſe monſtrous and ilfauoured baſtards to their forme. The Church of Rome, I ſay, that now is, we apply nothing to the Church of Rome that then was, which he fondly inculcateth without cauſe. The mother we confeſſe was a chaſt matron, but the daughter is growne to be a filthie harlot.

k Apoc. 18. 5.

## W. Biſhop.

*But that it is now become idolatrous*, M. Perkins *doth proue by his ſecond reaſon, gathered alſo (I warrant you, right learnedly) out of the text it ſelfe, where it is ſaid:* that the tenne hornes which ſignifie ten kings, ſhall hate the whore, and make her deſolate and naked: *which (as he ſaith) muſt be vnderſtood of Popiſh Rome. For whereas in former times, all the kings of the earth did ſubmit themſelues to the whore: now they haue begun to withdraw themſelues, and to make her deſolate: as the kings of Bohemia, Denmarke, Germany, England, Scotland, and other parts. In theſe his words is committed a moſt foule fault, by groſſe ouerſight and ignorance in the very text. What, be England, Scotland, Denmarke, (as for Bohemia, ruled by a Catholike Emperor, it muſt be omitted, as alſo many States of Germany,) be theſe Kingdoms your principall pillars of the new Goſpell, comprehended within the number of the ten, mentioned there in S. Iohn, which hate the harlot? Yes marry. Why then they are enemies of Chriſt, and Satans ſouldiers; for in the 13. verſe it is ſaid of theſe,* that they ſhall deliuer their power vnto the beaſt, *(which ſignifieth either the diuell or Antichriſt)* and

Cap. 17. ver. 16.

ſhall

shall fight with the Lambe, and the Lambe shall ouercome them, because he is Lord of Lords, and King of Kings. *Is not this doating in an high degree to infame so notoriously them, of whom he would speak most honourably and to make the speciall patrons of their new Gospel, the diuels captaines, and fiercely to wage battell against Christ Iesus. See, how heate of wrangling blindeth mens iudgements?*

R. ABBOT.

The direct conclusion intended by *M. Perkins* is, that *S. Iohns* prophecie was not accomplished in *heathenish Rome*, whereupon it remaineth to be vnderstood of the Church of Rome. The Argument which hee vseth to that purpose is inuincible, and *M. Bishop* cunningly ouerslippeth it without saying any thing directly to it. He chargeth *M. Perkins* with a *most foule fault*, and *grosse ouersight and ignorance in the text*, and with being *blinded with heat of wrangling*, when he himselfe, poore soule, knoweth not what hee saith, or if hee doe knowe, then carrieth himselfe ouer impudently therein. The case is plaine, if we doe but consider that *the beast* and *the harlot* belong both to one, as *S. Iohn* giueth vs to vnderstand, by describing [a] *the woman to be sitting vpon the beast*, in respect whereof the Rhemish Diuines doe name [b] *the whore, and the beast, and Antichrist* all as one. So *Perus* their Preacher of Mentz saith: [c] *The abomination of desolation which is the kingdom of Antichrist, Iohn in the Apocalypse vnderstandeth sometimes by the beast to which the Dragon gaue power, sometimes by the woman sitting vpon the beast, and making all to drinke of the wine of her fornication. S. Iohn* then giueth vs to vnderstand, that *tenne kings* should arise out of the dissolution of the Empire, as hath beene said. Of these *ten kings* he saith, [d] *These haue one minde, and shall giue their power and authoritie to the beast.* Hereupon it shall follow, that together with the beast [e] *they shall fight against the Lambe*, that is, against Iesus Christ. Afterward it shall come to passe, that *those ten kings* [f] *shall hate the whore* that sitteth vpon the beast, and *shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eate her flesh, and burne her with fire.* For, that it may appeare how they shall *giue their power to the beast*, and yet *hate the whore*, that is, submit themselues to Antichrists state and gouernment, and yet *burne the Babylon* wherein he hath raigned, hee addeth: [g] *For God hath put*

a Apoc. 17. 3. 7.
b *Rhem. Test. Annotat. Apoc.* 13. 1.
c *Perus in Mat.* 24. *Abhominationem desolationis quæ est regnum Antichristi Iosannes in Apocalypsi nunc quidem per Bestiam cui draco potestatem suam dedit, nunc per mulierem bestiæ insidentem intelligit, &c.*
d Vers. 13.
e Vers. 14.
f Vers. 16.
g Vers. 17.

in.

*in their hearts to fulfill his will, and to doe with one consent, for to give their kingdome to the beast, vntill the words of God be fulfilled.* So then *vntill the words of God be fulfilled*, and hee haue performed what in his secret iudgement he hath thereof decreed, those *ten kings* shall submit themselues to the *whore*, to the *beast*, that is, to Antichrist raigning in his *Babylon*. But when God hath finished his worke otherwise, then the kingdome of Antichrist shall bee ouerthrowne: the kings that before were subiect, shall withdraw their obedience from him; they shall hate *the whore of Babylon*, the citie of the beast, of Antichrist, and hauing stript her of the state and dominion whereby shee was aduanced and raigned ouer them, they shall furiously bend themselues against her, vntill they haue vtterly destroyed her. These things wee see cannot belong to the dayes of the heathen Emperours, as before is said, because the diuision of the Empire, and these *ten kings* were not in those times. It remaineth therefore, that the prophecie belongeth to times afterwards succeeding. Now being so vnderstood, as necessarily it must bee, wee see the same in part already fulfilled in the Church of Rome, and God in his good time will fulfill the rest. The Empire hath beene diuided into many Kingdoms: those kings haue all submitted their scepters to the power and authoritie of the Bishop of Rome. Hee hath plaid the Lord and tyrant ouer them, and they haue patiently suffered him so to doe. Yet God at length hath opened some of their eyes already, and they haue learned to see the deceits of Antichrist, and to hate the same. The like mercy hee will shew to the rest in his good time, and they shall ioyntly apply themselues to worke the confusion of that wicked strumpet. So then they, whom God hath already called, are not now as *M. Bishop* cauilleth, *the enemies of Christ, and Sathans soulders*; they were so, so long as they gaue their *power and kingdome to the beast*: but now they are Gods armie, and the captaines of the Lords hoste, to fight his battels against the beast and the whore, vntill they haue wrought his iudgement vpon them. Weigh the text (gentle reader) and consider well how readily it yeeldeth thee that that wee say thereof: and hereby conceiue, in what a pitifull case *M. Bishop* was, when hee was faine to passe it ouer as hee hath done. Yet his fellowes are beholding to him, that hee laieth lustily about him with words, and seemeth to haue a good courage, howsoeuer if he weighed the place at all, it could

could not be, but that in his owne bosome he was well priuie, that his cause was quite vndone.

## W. Bishop.

*But you proceed and say,* pag. 7. *that we further hold, that the bloud of the Saints and Martyrs was not shed in Rome, but in Hierusalem. Here is a confusion of men, and matters; for we say that the blood of many Saints rehearsed in the Apoc. was shed in Rome by the tyrannicall Emperours, but the martyring of those two principall witnesses,* Enoch *and* Elias, *(recorded in the eleuenth of the same) shall be at Hierusalem, aswell, because the text is very plaine for it;* specifying that their bodies shall lie in the streets of that great citie, where the Lord was crucified; *as for that the ordinarie Interpreters of that place do so take it. But* M. Perkins *holdeth, that the place where Christ was crucified, signifieth here not Hierusalem, but Rome; because Christ was crucified there in his members: so it might as well signifie any other place of persecution, as Rome: the reason therefore being nought worth, he fortifieth it with the name of* S. Hierome, *but citeth in the margent a letter of two vertuous matrons,* Paula *and* Eustochium. *Good sir, if* S. Hierome *had meant that that Epistle should haue had his authoritie, hee would haue set it out in his owne name, which seeing hee thought not expedient, set the authoritie of it aside, and vrge his reasons, if you thinke it woorth your labour, and you shall be answered. In the meane season (I hope) all sober Christians, will take the place where our Sauiour Christ was nailed on the crosse, to signifie rather Hierusalem, then Rome. And consequently, all that you haue alledged out of Scripture, to proone the whore of Babylon to figure the ecclesiasticall state of Rome, not to bee worth a rush.*

Chap. 17. Vers. 8. Epist. 17. Epist. 17.

## R. Abbot.

That which *M. Perkins* alledgeth, is according to their common fancie, that Antichrist shall haue his seat and kingdome at Hierusalem, & therefore shal there shed the bloud of the Martyrs of Christ. For som of them perceiuing, as *M. Bishop* might do, if his eyes were matches, that the prophecy of *S. Iohn* cannot be determined vnder the heathen Empire of Rome, doe post vs off to Hierusalem, there to find *the whore of Babylon drunke* with the bloud of Gods Saints,

and

and ſo vnderſtand that which is ſaid of the ſlaughter of [a] *the two witneſſes, whoſe bodies* are ſaid *to lie in the ſtreetes of the great citie, where our Lord alſo was crucified.* Thus becauſe Rome is moſt euidently deſcribed by *S. Iohn*, they tel vs one while that theſe things are indeed to be referred to Rome, but vnder the heathen Emperours: and becauſe there are ſome things that cannot poſsibly be applied to the time of the heathen Emperours, they another while put all ouer to Hieruſalem, and will by no meanes admit of Rome, albeit it be moſt manifeſtly pointed out for the place thereof. But as touching the place of the death of thoſe *two witneſſes*, *M. Perkins* rightly ſaith, that it is not meant of Hieruſalem, but of Rome. It is called *the great citie*, and what *the great city* importeth wee vnderſtand by the mention of it afterwards, [b] *the great city that raigneth ouer the Kings of the earth.* That was Rome, and not Hieruſalem, as hath beene before declared. Hieruſalem was deſtroyed 20. yeares or more before *S. Iohn* ſaw this Reuelation, and [c] *was fallen into duſt for euer*, as *Hierome* ſpeaketh, *the ruines* or *deſtructions thereof ſhall continue vntill the worlds ende.* [d] *Euen to the end of the world*, ſaith *Theodoret*, *the conſummation of her deſolation ſhall continue without any change.* The words of the Prophets are fully verefied in her. [e] *I will breake this city as a man breaketh a potters veſſell, that cannot be made whole againe.* [f] *Sion ſhall bee plowed as a field, and Hieruſalem ſhall be an heape, and the mountaine of the houſe ſhall be as the high places of the forreſt.* Saue onely for three turrets, and a part of the wall on the Weſt ſide, left to ſhew what a citie the Romanes had ouercome, it was ſo deſtroyed [g] *to the very foundations*, as *Ioſephus* recordeth, *and laid ſo flat, as that men would hardly haue thought that there had beene any habitation there.* Onely *Ælius Adrianus* the Emperour built neere vnto it another citie, which of his own name he called *Ælia*, which ſince hath gone with Chriſtians vnder the name of Hieruſalem, but hath indeed *neither the faſhion nor ſituation of Hieruſalem*, as *Arias Montanus* noteth for the iuſtifying of that prophecy, and therefore is but wrongly and corruptly called by that name. Therefore there neither is, nor ſhall be any Hieruſalem for Antichriſt to raigne in, nor *ſtreets* of Hieruſalem, wherein *the corpſes of thoſe two witneſſes* ſhould lie. To proue that Hieruſalem is not there vnderſtood, *M. Perkins* bringeth the teſtimonie of *Hierom* epiſtle, written in the name of *Paula* and *Euſtochium*, to *Marcella.*

a Apoc. 11. 7. 8.

b Chap. 17. 18.

c Hieron. in Iſa. lib. 4. cap. 19. Ciuitas eorum in æternos cineres collapſa eſt: vſq; ad conſummationem ſeculi ruinæ Hieruſalem permanſuræ ſunt.

d Theodoret. in Dan cap. 9. Vſque ad finem ſeculi conſummatio deſolationis abſque vlla mutatione permanebit.

e Ierem. 19. 11.

f Mich. 3. 12.

g Ioſeph. de bello Iudaic. c. 18. & 28.

h Arias Montan. in Mich. cap. 3. Illa quæ nunc Hieroſolyma dicitur ab Aelio Adriano Aeliæ nomine conſtructa, neque auti, quam faciem neque ſitum etiam retinet. Quod & obſcura quædam illius quæ extant veſtigia & deſcriptio ipſa manifeſtè arguunt, &c.

*Marvella.* M. *Bishop* answereth, that if *Hierome* had imagined that that epistle should haue had his authoritie, he would haue set it out in his owne name. Hee could not denie but that *Hierome* was the author of it, and if *Hierome* would not haue had it to carrie his authoritie, he would not surely haue giuen it place amongst the rest of his epistles. But that he should keepe it still vnder their names for whom he wrote it, there was a necessarie cause, because there are some circumstances in it that are appliable to them onely, and not to him. Now *Hierome* though he there denie that *great citie* to be Hierusalem, yet doth not expound it to be Rome; but that is very manifest of it selfe, because it is *the beast* that shall *fight against the two witnesses and kill them*, and *the beast*, as wee haue before seene, is the Romane state and gouernment, and Rome the citie of seuen hils, the place and seat thereof. But to the contrary M. *Bishop* vrgeth, that it is said to bee *the city where our Lord also was crucified*; and that he saith, *all sober Christians will take number to signifie Hierusalem then Rome.* Thus no man must be taken to be sober that will not serue the Popes turne. Yet wee take our selues to be sober, and because we are so, we know that the words are not to be vnderstood of that that is not, but of that that is, and therefore not of Hierusalem, which neither is nor shall be, as hath beene said, but of Rome, which is and shall bee, vntill God bring vpon it the destruction which he hath pronounced. For that wee are not properly there to vnderstand the place *where Christ was crucified*, beside that we conceiue it by the course of the whole booke, *which as Hierome* saith, *is spiritually to be vnderstood*; the place it selfe plainely directeth vs thereto. *The great citie*, saith S. *Iohn*, *which spiritually is called Sodome and Egypt, where our Lord also was crucified.* It is *spiritually* called Sodome and Egypt, and it is *spiritually* the place where our Lord was crucified. Now the citie where our Lord was corporally crucified being vtterly perished, there is no other *great city* to which we haue any reason in special manner to referre it *spiritually*, but onely the city of Rome. *By authority of the Romane Empire*, as the Rhemists rightly acknowledge, *Christ himself was put to death*, and by the same Romish authoritie the members of Christ were put to death, both in Rome it selfe, and throughout the whole world. The members of Christ are *spiritually* Christ, but he reckoneth and accounteth them as himselfe. Of the members of his mysti-

m Math. 25. 40.
n Acts 9. 4.
o Origen. in Ierem. hom. 11. Per singulos martyres Iesus condemnatur. Si cõdemnatur Christianus pro hoc tantùm quòd Christianus est, Christus est qui condemnatur.
p Phil. 3. 10.
q 2. Cor. 1. 5.
r Heb. 13. 13.
s Gal. 6. 17.
t Ibid. 2. 19.

u Ambros. lib. 5. epist. 32. in Orat. cont. Auxent.

x Respondit Christus; venio Romam iterùm crucifigi. Intellexit ergò Petrus quod iterum Christus erat crucifigendus in seruulo, &c.

y Areth. in Apoc. 11. Extra. dissimè præconium Christi innatabilitèr in eccl. fiat receptum est Enoch venturum esse cum Elia Thesbite.

vnto body, he saith, "*Inasmuch as ye have done it vnto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it vnto me.*" *Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?* *In enemy of the martyrs Iesus is condemned. If a Christian be condemned for no other cause but for that he is a Christian, it is Christ that is condemned.* Therefore those things that are done to the faithfull for the name and faith of Christ, are termed *Christs sufferings*, *the death of the Lord Iesus*, *the reproach of Christ*, *the markes of the Lord Iesus*, & therein they are sayd *to be crucified with Christ*. Seeing then the bloud of the martyrs hath been shed so abundantly in *the streetes* of Rome it selfe, and by authority from Rome, the like bloud hath been shed and spilt in the *streetes* of all other cities and places throughout the world, which because they were vnder the dominion of the citie of Rome, may well bee called *the streets of Rome*, therefore Rome aboue all other is the place whereof it may truely sayd, that it is *the great citie where spiritually our Lord was crucified*, and *in the streets* whereof the Lords *witnesses* were slaine. And that Christ was crucified at Rome, *M. Bishop* must not deny, because he must not deny that which *Ambrose* reporteth concerning *Peters* being crucified at Rome. He telleth, that "*when the Pagan infidels sought for Peter to put him to death, the faithfull requested him that for a while he should go aside, and should reserue himselfe to instruct and strengthen the people of Christ. Whereupon at night he was going out, and seeing Christ vnmeete him in the gate, and to be entring into the citie, he said vnto him, Lord, whither goest thou?* Christ answered, *I come to Rome to be crucified againe.* *Peter then vnderstood, that Christ was in his seruant to be crucified againe. Therefore he went backe of his owne accord, and when the Christians demaunded the matter, he gaue them this answer, and being straightwayes taken he glorified the Lord Iesus.* Sith then that in the crucifying of *Peter* Christ was crucified, and *Peter* was crucified at Rome, it cannot be denied but that Christ also was crucified at Rome, and therefore that Rome is rightly called the citie where our Lord was crucified. As for that that he saith, *that the two witnesses* there spoken of, are *Enoch* and *Elias*, it is a meere fable, and hath no probabilitie or likelihood of truth. Some curious heads finding mention of two *witnesses*, must needs vse their wits to deuise to what two particuler men they might apply that name. *Aretbas* saith, "*that it was constantly receiued that they should be Enoch and Elias.* But *Victorinus*,

who

who was farre more ancient then *Austen* telleth vs otherwise. [x] *Many thinke* (they did but thinke) *that one of these witnesses was Elias, the other either Enoch or Moses: but they are both dead. Many the death of Ieremy is not found: for all our ancient haue deliuered that that other is Ieremie.* Yet [a] *Hilary* thinketh, that hee that shall come with *Elias* shall be *Moses* and no other. Such vncertainety is there in mens presumptions, when they will determine of that which God hath said, onely by their conceits. Very probable it is that it is an allusion to that [b] *that is written in the law*, as our sauior saith, *that the witnesse of two is true*, God thereby giuing to vnderstand, that notwithstanding the fury of the beast, and the cruelty of persecutors and tyrants, yet he will neuer want *two witnesses*, that is, sufficient for the iustifying of his truth. We may otherwise though to the same effect referre it to the [c] *two olive branches* spoken of by the Prophet *Zachary*, which did drop oile into the lampe that was to burne and giue light before the Lord, as to signifie that God would prouide alwaies to haue some by whom he would preserue the light of the Church, and no lesse vphold it, then by the *two olive branches*, that is, the kingdome and the Priesthood, he did amongst the people of the Iewes. *S. Austin* in his Homilies vpon the Apocalyps, if at least he were the author of them, expoundeth [d] *the two witnesses* to bee *the two Testaments*, whom *Beda* also followeth therein: and that we may know the vanity of that tale of *Enoch* and *Elias*, hee saith that [e] *their conceit is wholly excluded, who thinke that those two witnesses shall be two certaine men, and that they be ascended to heauen in the clowdes before the comming of Christ. For how*, saith he, *should the inhabitants of the earth reioice of the death of two, when as they should dwell in one City? and how should they send gifts one to another, if there be but three daies, that before they can reioice of their death, they shall haue sorrow againe of their resurrection?* He gathereth out of the very text it selfe, that the place cannot be meant of two particular men, because the inhabitants through the world can haue no such reioicing of two men put to death in one place, who within three daies must rise againe, and therefore necessarily we must admit another construction thereof. That is briefly this, as more at large might bee shewed, if occasion so required, that the seruants of God for *the word of their testimony*, the doctrine of Iesus Christ, witnessed by the old and new Testament, should be murthered and slaine in the

x *Victorin. in Apoc. 11. apud sixt. senens. Bibl. lib. 6. anno. 346. Multipatuum ex his testibus esse Eliã, alterum aut Elizeum aut Mosẽ, sed vtrique mortuus sunt.*

*Ieremia autem mors non inuenitur, quia omnes veteres nostri tradiderunt illum esse Ieremiam.*

a *Hilar. in Matt. can. 20. Mosen & Eliam duos prophetas intelligimus præuenientes aduentum Antichristi. &c.*

b *Iohn 8. 17.*

c *Zach. 4. 3. 12.*

d *August. in Apoc. hom. 8. Beda in Apoc. 11.*

e *August. ibid. Excluditur omnis suspicio quorundam qui putant hos duos testes, duos viros esse, & ante aduentum Christi cœlum in nubibus ascendisse. Quomodo autem facturi sint habitantes terram de duorum nece gaudere, cum in una ciuitate morerentur, & vnera vnicè non interfere, si tres dies sunt quo ante non gaudeant de nece consurgunt de resurrectione?*

streets and cities of the Romane Empire, and their bodies dishonorably cast forth and left to the fowles and beasts, whom yet notwithstanding God after a time certainly determined, would challenge from that despite and reproch, and make their name glorious, so that they should seeme euen to rise from death to life, and as it were from hell to be raised vp to heauen; which came afterwards to passe, when God by *Constantine* freed his Church from the persecution of that time.

W. Bishop.

*Now let vs come to the ancient and learned men, whom you cite in fauour of your opposition. The first is* S. Bernard, *who saith, that* they are the ministers of Christ, but they serue Antichrist. *Of whom speaketh that good religious Father? forsooth of some officers of the Court of Rome. Good: who were (as he saith) the ministers of Christ, because they were lawfully called by the* Pope *to their places, but serued Antichrist, for that they behaued themselues corruptly in their callings. And so this maketh more against you, then for you, approuing the lawfull officers of Rome, to be Christs ministers. The second place is alledged out of him yet more impertinently, your selfe confessing presently, that those words were not spoken of the* Pope, *but of his enemy: The reason yet there set downe, pleaseth you exceedingly: which you vouch so clearely that it seemeth to beare flat against you; for you inferre that the* Pope, *and all others since that time, be vsurpers, out of this reason of* S. Bernard. *Because forsooth, that the Antipope called* Innocentius, *was chosen by the King of Almaine, France, England, &c. and their whole clergy, and people. For if* Innocentius *were an Antichrist and vsurper, because he was elected by so many Kings and people: then belike he that had no such election, but is chosen by the Cardinals of Rome onely is true* Pope. *This, your words declare, but your meaning (as I take it) is quite contrary. But of this matter and manner of election, shall be treated hereafter if neede require: it sufficeth for this present that you finde no relefe at all in* S. Bernard, *touching the maine point, that either the* Pope, *or Church of Rome is Antichrist. And all the world might marueil, if out of so sweet a Doctor, and so obedient vnto the* Pope, *any such poison might be sucked; specially waighing well, what hee hath written vnto one of them to whom he speaketh thus,* Go to, let vs yet enquire more

Lib. 2. de Consid. ad Eugen.

diligently

diligently, who thou art, and what perſon thou beareſt in the Church of God, during the time. Who art thou? A great Prieſt, the higheſt Biſhop: thou art the Prince of Biſhops, the heire of the Apoſtles, and in dignitie *Aaron*, in authoritie, *Moſes*, in Power, *Peter*, thou art hee to whom the keyes were deliuered, to whom the ſheepe were committed: There are indeed alſo other Porters of Heauen, and Paſtors of flockes; but thou art ſo much the more glorious, as thou haſt inherited a more excellent name aboue them: they haue their flockes allotted to them, to each man one: but to thee all were committed, as one flocke to one man: thou art not onely Paſtor of the ſheepe, but of all other Paſtors, thou alone art the Paſtor. *And much more to this purpoſe, which being his cleere opinion of the* Pope, *how abſurd it is, out of certaine blind places, and broken ſentences of his together, that he thought the* Pope *of Rome to be neither ſheepe, nor Paſtor of Chriſts Church, but very Antichriſt himſelfe.*

*There is a groſſe fault, alſo in the Canon of* Pope Nicholas *as hee citeth it*: that the Pope was to bee created by the Cardinals, Biſhops of Rome. *As though there were ſome thirtie or fourtie Biſhops of Rome at once, but of the matter of election elſe where.*

## R. Abbot.

I confeſſe the places of *S. Bernard* doe not ſerue directly to that purpoſe to which they are brought. In naming Antichriſt, hee did not intend thereby, that we ſhould vnderſtand the Pope; yet *M. Biſhop* without cauſe taketh aduantage of his firſt words, becauſe the Pope beeing Antichriſt indeed, nothing hindreth, but that they who by office, and calling, and dutie, are the miniſters and ſeruants of Chriſt, may in action and practiſe perfidiouſly and treacherouſly yeeld their ſeruice to the Pope. Antichriſt ſhall [a] *ſit in the temple of God*, and therefore the officers of the temple of God ſhall bee ſubiect vnto him. That which by inſtitution is the *houſe of God*, ſhall by his occupation become *a den of theeues*: they who by dutie are ſubiects, ſhall in following him be rebels and traitors; paſtors ſhall become beaſts; watchmen ſhall be blind men, and they who haue places for one vſe, ſhall turne them to another. Thus *S. Bernard* ſaith of the Cleargie of Rome: [b] *They are the miniſters of Chriſt, and they*

[a] 2. Theſſ. 2. 4.

[b] *Bernard in Cant. ſer. 33. Miniſtri Chriſti ſunt & ſeruium Antichriſto.*

*ferue Antichrist*: the true vse of their places is the seruice of Christ, but they abuse the same to the helping forward of the kingdome of Antichrist. He describeth at large in that place the horrible corruption of the Church of Rome. [c] *A filthy contagion*, saith he, *is creeping through the whole bodie of the Church, by how much the more generally, so much the more desperately; and so much the more dangerously by how much the more inwardly.* He sheweth how the Pastours of Churches, Deanes, Archdeacons, Bishops, Archbishops, got their places by Simonie, and abused them to luxurie and all excesse. He complaineth that [d] *the plague of the Church was inward and incurable*, and that by *filthie life, by filthy lucre, by filthy company, and by the matter that walketh in the darke*, that is, by Simonie. Hee concludeth thus, [e] *It remaineth, that the noone walking diuel be brought forth to seduce, if there be any in Christ, yet continuing in their simplicitie. The same is Antichrist, who shall counterfeit himselfe to be not onely day, but noone day, and shall be exalted aboue all that is called God, &c.* Againe, hauing vpon another occasion afterwards entred into the like discourse of the strange declination of the state of the Church, he endeth in like sort; [f] *It remaineth, that the man of sinne be reuealed, the sonne of perdition, &c.* He saw not that the Pope was Antichrist, yet he saw that the Church was then by the gouernment of the Pope as a horse sadled and bridled, and fully furnished for Antichrist to get vp and ride vpon. Yea and it appeareth by that that *M. Perkins* secondly citeth, that he did not thinke *S. Peters* chaire to be vncapable of Antichrist, in that hee saith: [g] *The beast spoken of in the Reuelation, to which is giuen a mouth speaking blasphemies, and to make warre with the Saints, possesseth the chaire of Peter, as a Lyon ready to the prey.* He spake this indeed of the Antipope, but yet it appeareth that hee saw the time then fitting for the kingdome of Antichrist, and that Antichrist might be likely to sit in *Peters* chaire, and therefore was not farre from seeing and deeming that the Pope was Antichrist. But what hee saw not, others had seene before that time, when [h] *many in their Sermons*, as *Auentinus* saith, *did publikely deliuer, that Hildebrand was Antichrist; that vnder the title of Christ, he did the businesse of Antichrist. He sitteth in Babylon*, said they, *in the temple of God; he is exalted aboue all that is worshipped, as if he were very God: he boasteth that he cannot erre: what soeuer he saith, he taketh it to be the law of God.* The same *Auentinus* mentioneth, that

[1] almost

c *Ibid. serpit horribilis putrida labes per omne corpus ecclesiæ, & quo latius eo desperatiùs; eoq; periculosius, quo interiùs.*

d *Intestina & insanabilis est plaga ecclesiæ, &c. A turpi vita, à turpi quæstu, à turpi commercio, a negotio denique perambulante in tenebris.*

e *Superest vt iam de medio fiat dæmonium meridianum ad seducendos si qui in Christo residui sunt adhuc permanentes in simplicitate sua. Ipse est Antichristus qui se non solùm diem sed etiam meridiem mentietur.*

f *In Psal. Qui habitat ser. 6. superest vt reueletur homo peccati, &c.*

g *Idem epist. 125. Bestia illa de Apocalypsi cui datum est os loquentis blasphemias & bellum gerere cum sanctis Petri sedem occupat, tanquam Leo paratus ad prædam.*

h *Auent. Annal. lib. 5. Plerique tum Hildebrandum pro concione Antichristum esse prædicant: sitque Christi, inquiunt, Antichristi negotium agitat. In Babylonia in templo dei sedet. Super omne id quod dicitur aut colitur extollitur quasi deus sit, se errare non posse gloriatur, &c. Quicquid dixerit, legem Deus putat, &c.*

[l] almost all good and plaine men, that dealt iustly, ingenuously, and simply did then deliuer in writing, that the kingdom of Antichrist was then begun, for that they saw that those things were then come to passe, which Christ our Sauiour had spoken of so many yeares before. Long after that he bringeth in *Eberhard* the Archbishop of Iuuauia, of whom I spake before, saying, [k] Vnder the title of the highest Bishop, the garment of a shepheard, we perceiue, if we be not blind, a most cruell Wolfe. *Hildebrand*, saith he, a hundred and seuenty yeares agoe, did first vnder shew of religion lay the foundation of the Empire of Antichrist, &c. Those Priests of Babylon desire to raigne alone; they can indure no equall. Hee that is the seruant of seruants coueteth to be Lord of Lords, euen as though he were God. Hee speaketh great words as though he were God, euen that wicked man, whom they are wont to call Antichrist, in whose forehead a name of blasphemie is written, *I am God, I cannot erre*. Thus [l] *Mathew* of Paris sheweth, how *Robert Grosthead* bishop of Lincolne in the time of King *Henrie* the third, being extreamely afflicted and grieued, to see the desolation and confusion of the Church, by the practises of the Bishop of Rome, a little before his death called some of his Cleargie to him, and by argument and reason informed them, that the Pope was Antichrist, for that he was [m] *a destroyer of soules*, for that he by his [n] *Non obstante* violated and ouerturned all the constitutions of the holy Fathers; for that hee multiplied [o] mischeifes and inconueniences in the Church, &c. I omit many other that might be brought particularly acknowledging and testifying this point: but by these it may appeare, that both before the time of *S. Bernard*, and after, it was a thing amongst good men commonly beleeued and spoken, that the Pope was Antichrist. Yea *M. Perkins* well obserueth, that the reason whereby *S. Bernard* proued *Anacletus* the Antipope to be Antichrist, proueth all the Popes since to haue bin Antichrists, because they haue not beene elected according to that forme whereby he then iustified *Innocentius* to be the true bishop of Rome, that is, with consent of the Emperour, the Princes of Christendome, and the whole Cleargie, beeing since chosen by the Cardinals onely. And this he further confirmeth by a decree of Pope *Nicholas* the second, for the election of the Pope, that it shall be with the liking of the [p] Emperour, and performed by [q] *the Cardinal Bishops, but with the consent of the rest of the Cleargie and Laitie: and if any man*, saith he, *bee set in the Apostolike seate* with-

i *Ibid. Plerique omnes boni, aperti, iusti, ingenui, simplices tum impraesum Antichristi coepisse quod ea quae Christus seruator noster tot annos ante nobis cantauit euenisse, eo tempore cernebant, memoriae literarum prodiderunt.*

k *Idem. lib. 7. Sub Pont. maximi titulo, pastorii pelle, lupum saeuissimum nisi caeci sumus sentimus. Hildebrandus ante annos centum & septuaginta primus specie religionis Antichristi imperii fundamenta iecit, &c. Flamines illi Babylonie sola regnare cupiunt: ferre parem non possint, &c. Qui seruus seruorum est, dominus dominorum perinde ac si deus forent esse cupit, &c. Ingentia loquitur quasi vere Deus esset, &c.*

l *Dist. 33. In nomine salua semper honore & reuerentia Imperatoris ista fiant.*

m *Electio Romani Pontificis in potestate Cardinalium Episcoporum sit: ita vt si quis Apostolicae sedi sine praemissa concordi & canonica electione consecratus fuerit, extunc sequentium ordinum religiosorum, Clericorum & Laicorum con-*

*sensu imbranizatur, non Papa vel Apostolicus, sed Apostaticus habeatur.*

*without the foresaid consording and canonicall election of the Cardinals, and the consent of the religious states following the Cleargie and Laity, he shall not be accounted Pope or Apostolicall, but Apostatical,* which is as much to say, as Antichristian. The Popes then beeing not now, nor hauing beene of long time chosen by this rule, but onely by the Colledge of Cardinals, are found to be Apostates and Antichrists by the sentence and decree of the Pope himselfe. Hitherto *M. Bishop* saith not a word, though he confesse that he knew *M. Perkins* meaning well enough, which indeed was somewhat amisse set downe, by putting the *Antipope called Innocentius* for *the Pope called Innocentius*. He had nothing whereby to excuse the Pope from being Antichrist euen by his owne decrees, and therefore putteth the matter ouer to another place, where hee neuer meant to say any thing of it. Onely in the end he chargeth *M. Perkins* with a *grosse fault* in citing the Canon of Pope *Nicholas*, for saying *that the Pope was to bee created by the Cardinals, bishops of Rome; as though*, saith he, *there were some thirtie or fortie Bishops of Rome*. Belike it was darke, and his eyes did not well serue him, or else he might haue seene, that *M. Perkins* did not say, *by the Cardinals, Bishops of Rome*, as hee hath set downe, and pointed amisse, but *by the Cardinall Bishops of Rome*, that is, by the Cardinals of Rome which are Bishops. For they are all Cardinals of Rome, but some are *Cardinall Bishops*, some *Cardinall Priests*, some *Cardinall Deacons*, and according to this distinction *M. Perkins* named the *Cardinall Bishops of Rome*, the Popes Canon requiring *the Cardinall Bishops* to bee the Electors of the Pope. As touching that which *M. Bishop* citeth out of S. *Bernard* for his opinion of the Pope, I answer him, that we doubt not, but that *S. Bernard* had a very high opinion of the Popes place; but I answer him withall, that *S. Bernard* had a higher opinion of the Popes place, then he had of the Pope himselfe. He knew well, that though the Popes place were such in the Church of Christ, as hee describeth it to be, yet the Pope by the abusing of his place, might be very Antichrist himselfe. Hee wisheth Pope *Eugenius* to remember and consider, what person, what place and office, according to his conceipt, he did beare in the Church, thereby to moue him vpon conscience thereof to the redressing of those intolerable enormities and corruptions, that were then growne in the Church and Court of Rome. For in those bookes *De consideratione*, he doth purposely

poſely bend himſelfe to lay forth the deformities and abuſes then preuailing: to ſhew how the Biſhop of Rome by temporall dominion and princely pompe, did degenerate from *Peter* and the reſt of the Apoſtles, and did rather ſucceed *Conſtatine* then him: to note the defaults and corruptions of gouernment, of iudiciall proceedings, of appeales to Rome, of the Popes diſpenſations, of the neglect of the puniſhment of offendors: to ſhew the neglect of the Cleargie in teaching the people, making themſelues fitter for any other vſe, then for that. Yea ſuch was the horrible apoſtaſie and iniquity raigning at that time, as that by way of complaint vnto Ieſus Chriſt, he ſaith thereof with exceeding griefe in another place, *The whole company of Chriſtian people ſeemeth to haue conſpired againſt thee, from the leaſt euen to the greateſt; from the ſole of the foot to the top of the head there is nothing ſound: iniquitie is gone forth from the ancients, the Iudges, thy Vicars which ſeeme to gouerne thy people. Alas, alas, O Lord God, for they are foremoſt in perſecuting thee, who ſeeme to loue ſupremacie, and to beare principalitie in thy Church. They haue taken poſſeſſion of the tower of Sion, they haue ſeized vpon the munitions thereof, and thenceforth freely and by authoritie they betray the whole citie to the fire. Their wretched conuerſation is the miſerable ſubuerſion of thy people, &c. The ſacred decrees and orders are yeelded to opportunities of filthy lucre: the ſauing of ſoules is the thing laſt thought of. The reſt alſo deale wickedly againſt Chriſt, and there are many Antichriſts in our times.* Now the due conſideration of the ſe words wee ſuppoſe may ſomewhat qualifie *M. Biſhops* opinion of the words by himſelfe alleadged, becauſe hereby we plainely vnderſtand, not by broken, but by perfect ſentences, that whatſoeuer *S. Bernard* conceiued of the dignity and duty of the Popes place, yet that hee very well ſaw, that by euill vſage thereof the Popes in his time were become the very enemies and perſecutors of Chriſt, euen they who (as he ſaith) were *Chriſts Vicars*, and had *the ſupremacie and principalitie* in the Church of Chriſt. And ſo we find that the high Prieſt of the Iewes, who by Gods owne ordinance and inſtitution was a figure of Chriſt, and ſate in the place of Chriſt, yet by Apoſtaſie and iniquitie became an Antichriſt, a perſecutor of Chriſt, and ſolemnly gaue ſentence againſt Chriſt. In like ſort therefore nothing letteth, but that the Pope may now be Antichriſt, albeit his place had bin at the firſt appointed by Chriſt: but much more now, in that his

r *Bernard. in conuerſ. S. Pauli Ser. 1. Coniuraſſe contra te videtur vniuerſitas: Chriſtiani populi à minimo vſque ad maximum: à planta pedis, vſque ad verticem, non eſt ſanitas vlla. Egreſſa eſt iniquitas à ſenioribus, iudicibus, Vicarijs tuis qui videntur regere populum tuum, &c. Heu! heu! Domine Deus, quia ipſi ſunt in perſecutione tua primi qui videntur in Eccleſia tua diligere primatum, gerere principatum. Arcem Sion occupauerunt, apprehenderunt munitiones, & vniuerſam deinceps liberè & poteſtatiuè tradunt incendio ciuitatem. Miſera eorum conuerſatio plebis tuæ miſerabilis ſubuerſio eſt, &c. Datis ſunt ſacri gradus in occaſionem turpis lucri &c. De animarum ſalute minima cogitatio eſt, &c. Iniquè agunt & cæteri contra Chriſtum, multique noſtris temporibus ſunt Antichriſti.*

his place is no diuine institution, but onely humane presumption, affected by ambition, attempted by rebellion, yeelded vnto by superstition, established and possessed by tyrannie and crueltie, by villanie and treacherie: vpholden by the deuices of Sycophants and Parasites, who haue vsed all manner falshood and deceit to inie& into the mindes of men an opinion of it. *S. Bernard* therfore by error attributed to the Pope that which indeed is none of his: and although for the credit of the Popes authoritie, he alleadge some words out of the Gospel vsed to *S. Peter*, yet he bringeth no Scripture to proue, either that that which hee giueth to the Pope in that description, did euer belong to *Peter*, or that that which in the Gospel is spoken to *Peter*, belongeth to the Pope. Hee attributeth to the Pope to be [s] *prince of Bishops*, and *highest Bishop*, directly against the decree of the African Councell, one Canon whereof is, that [t] *the Bishop of the first sea* (which was Rome) *should not be called prince of Bishops, or highest Bishop, or such like, but onely the Bishop of the first sea.* His error therefore is apparant in this point, by the sentence of the Councell, but it is more absurd in some other words that hee vseth, howsoeuer we presume that his meaning was more tolerable then his words. For to say as he doth, that the Pope is [u] *by order Melchisedec, and by annointing Christ*, what construction hee would make of his owne words we know not, and *M. Bishop* by omitting those words, sheweth that he was ashamed of them, but wee know that it soundeth little lesse then blasphemie against Christ.

[s] *Tu es princeps Episcoporum, summus Pontifex.*
[t] *Concil. Aphric. cap. 6. Vt prima sedis Episcopus non appelletur Princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, aut aliquid huiusmodi, sed tantùm prima sedis Episcopus.*
[u] *Ordine Melchisedec, vnctione Christus.*

W. BISHOP.

M. Perkins *hauing lightly skirmished with a broken sentence or two out of one Catholike Author, fleeth to a late heretike called* Joachim, *and quoteth* Iewel *for relator of it. A worshipfull testimonie of one Heretike, and that vpon the report of another: and hee the most lying Author of these daies. As for the late Poet* Petrarch, *his words might easily be answered, but because he quoteth no place, I will not stand to answer it. But to close vp this first combate, a sentence is set downe out of the famous Martyr* Irenæus, *that Antichrist should be* Lateinos, *a* Romane. *Here be as many faults as words. That learned auncient Doctor discoursing of Antichrist his proper name, out of these words of the Reuelation,* the number of the beast is 666. *and obseruing the letters*

Cap. 13.

of

*of the Greeke Alphabet, (by which they do number, as we do by cyphers) saith: that among others the word* Lateinos *doth containe those letters which amount iust to the number of* 666. *and consequently that Antichrists proper name perhaps might be* Lateinos, *but more likely it is to be* Teitan, *as he saith there, and lastly, that it is most vncertaine what his name shall be. See the place (gentle Reader) and learne to beware of such deceitfull merchants, as make no conscience to corrupt the best Authors: and beeing often warned of it, will neuer learne to amend.* Irenæus *leaueth it most doubtfull what shall be Antichrists name: And among diuers words esteemeth* Lateinos *to bee the vnlikeliest. And yet* M. Perkins *reporteth him to say resolutely, that his name shall bee* Lateinos: *and then to make vp the matter, turneth* Lateinos, *a proper name with* S. Irenæus *into Romane, an appellatiue, which noteth only his countrey. Fie vpon that cause, which cannot bee vpholden and maintained, but by a number of such paltry shifts.*

R. Abbot.

It followeth not that euery man who in a point of doctrine conceiueth amisse, is presently an heretike, for so many should be heretikes both of auncienter and later writers, who notwithstanding by *M. Bishop* himselfe are reckoned for good Catholikes. *Ioachim* indeed deliuered against *Peter Lombard*, a pernicious opinion concerning the Godhead. The councell of *Laterane* condemned his opinion, but because he was not wilfull in his errour, it made no heretike of him. Therefore in that councell it is noted in the margent, [a] *Not Ioachim himselfe, but his booke is condemned.* *M. Bishop* therfore is too presumptuous, to pronounce him an heretike, whom the councell did not so pronounce. *M. Perkins* citeth the wordes of *Ioachim* out of Bishop *Iewels* sermons, but hee is also reiected as *another heretike*, yea and *the most lying Author of these daies.* But we would gladly haue *M. Bishop* to learne that point of honest ciuilitie and good manners, not to speake so rudely of them whom hee knoweth not. I dare say hee neuer read Bishop *Iewel*, nor doth know whether he tel truth or not; only the *Magistri nostri* haue told him that so he must say. And indeed it concerneth them that *Bishop Iewel* be taken for *a lying author*, for if hee haue reported truth, then in miserable case are they. But his true & faithfull dealing wil sufficiently

[a] *Concil. Later. ran. cap. 2. in marg. Non ipse Ioachim, sed eius liber damnatur.*

ently iuſtifie it ſelfe to them that are carefull to learne the truth, euen to the ſhame and confuſion of theſe Sycophants, who labour by impeaching the truth of others, to gaine opinion and credit to their owne lies. But for this matter, if he will not take it to be true vpon Biſhop *Iewels* report, I will doe him the fauour to referre him to another author, who is liable to no exception. That is *Roger Houeden*, who writeth that *Ioachim* the Abbot in a diſcourſe before king *Richard* the firſt of our land, [b] *did ſay concerning Antichriſt, that he was then borne in Rome, and ſhould be ſet vp aloft in the Apoſtolike ſea.* Then was indeede the Biſhop of Rome growne to that height of inſolencie and pride, as that he openly practiſed rebellion againſt the Emperour his Lord and maſter. Yea ſuch was the incredible arrogancie and impudencie of this Antichriſtian beaſt, as that ſoone after that ſpeech of *Ioachim*, [c] *Celeſtinus* the third beeing to crowne the Emperour *Henrie* the ſixt, tooke the Crowne betwixt his two feete, and made the Emperour to bowe downe, that with his feete he might ſet it vpon his head, which hauing done, with one of his feet hee ſtrooke it off againe, to giue him to vnderſtand, that it was in his power againe to bereaue him of the Crowne. As for *Petrarch*, I let him paſſe, becauſe though freely vttering what he thought, hee called *Rome Babylon*, & ſpake many things to touch the triple crowne, yet it ſeemeth that for feare of diſpleaſure he was content afterwards to make the beſt of that hee had ſaid. There remaineth onely *Irenæus*, who ſetting downe diuers coniectures as touching the name of the beaſt, which *S. Iohn* ſaith ſhall containe *the number 666*, bringeth this for one, that [d] λατεινος is the name imported by that number, and that Antichriſt haply ſhall bee knowne by that name. Againſt this *M. Biſhop* hath ſundrie exceptions, and all to little purpoſe. Firſt he ſaith, that *Irenæus amongſt diuers words eſteemeth* Lateinos *to be the vnlikelieſt.* But whether that be true, let the Reader eſteeme by *Irenæus* his owne words. [e] *The name Lateinos*, ſaith hee, *containing the number of ſixe hundred ſixtie ſixe, is very likely, becauſe the trueſt kingdome hath that name. For they are the Latins that now raigne, but neither will we preſume of this.* *Irenæus* himſelfe ſaith, *It is very likely: M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that *Irenæus* ſaith, *It is the moſt vnlikely of all others*: hereby let it appeare who beſt deſerueth the name of *a lying author*. Againe, he ſaith that *Irenæus meaneth it to be a proper*

b Rog. Houed. Annal. lib. 2. anno 1190. De iſto Antichriſto dicit idem Ioachim quòd iam natus eſt in ciuitate Romana, & in ſede Apoſtolica ſublimabitur.

c Idem anno 1191.

d λ. 30.
α. 1.
τ. 300.
ε. 5.
ι. 10.
ν. 50.
ο. 70.
ς. 200.
666.

e Irenæus lib. 5. Sed & λατεινος nomen ſexcentorũ ſexaginta ſex numerum habens valdè veriſimile eſt, quoniam verißimum regnum hoc habet vocabulum: Latini enim ſunt qui nunc regnant, ſed non in hoc nos gloriabimur.

per name, whereas wee make it an appellative. But this appeareth to be falſe, by the reaſon that is giuen by *Irenæus* of the likelihood of the name. For if hee ſhould haue that name of the kingdome and countrie where hee ſhould raigne, as the words of *Irenæus* import, then it is manifeſt that it ſhould not be his proper name. Thirdlie, he alledgeth that *Irenæus* maketh [f] *more a matter likelie word.* I mention not theſe things in the ſame order as hee hath ſet them downe, but as they yeeld themſelues moſt conueniently to bee ſpoken of. Now it is true that *Irenæus* ſaith, that that name is [g] *moſt wont by to be beleeued*, but that helpeth *M. Biſhop* nothing, becauſe that name by the Popes owne decrees lighteth fully vpon himſelfe. For *Titan*, as *Irenæus* noteth, is the name of *the Sunne*, and the Pope maketh himſelfe [h] *the Sunne*, and the Emperour *the Moone*, and will haue vs to thinke, that ſo much as the Moone is leſſer then the Sunne, ſo much is the Emperour inferiour to him. *Titan is a name applied to Idols*, ſaith *Irenæus*, and what is the Pope but an Idoll, caried vp and downe vpon mens ſhoulders like an Idoll, bedecked like an Idoll, publikly adored and worſhipped like an Idoll? *Titan*, ſaith he, *is a name containing oſtentation of reuenge*, and who hath euer more proudly vaunted reuenge then the Pope hath done, whoſe ſtile againſt ſuch as offend him vſually is this, [i] *We decree that hee ſhall bee vtterly accurſed*: [k] *we bind him with a bond of perpetuall curſe*: [l] *let him know that he ſhall incurre the indignation of Almighty God, and of the bleſſed Apoſtles Peter and Paul*? yea and not onely by words, but by deedes hath made euen the earth to groane, and the Princes thereof to ſtagger and fall vnder the burden of his reuenge. But of this name alſo *Irenæus* will affirme nothing, and therefore fourthly *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *Irenæus leaueth it vncertaine and doubtfull what his name ſhall be*. And ſo he doth indeed, but with this direction, that [m] *the ſureſt way and without danger, is to waite for the fulfilling of the Prophecie*. Now the fulfilling of the prophecie hath made that cleare and certaine to vs, which ſome did coniecture then, and could but coniecture, being ſo many hundred yeeres before the fulfilling of it. The number of the name of [n] *the beaſt*, that is, of Antichriſt, is ſet downe in the thirteenth chapter. Afterwards in the ſeuenteenth chapter, many things are further added for the better vnderſtanding of all that went before. Now there wee vnderſtand, that Antichriſt ſhall bee [o] *a king* that is, as before hath beene

f ϙ 300.
o 5.
ι 10.
ϙ 300.
α 1.
ϙ 10.
666.

g *Omnium nominum quæ apud nos inueniuntur magis fide dignum eſt.*

h Decret. al. Gregor. de maioritat. & adcelſita. *Quæ ſit eſt inter ſolem & lunam, tanta inter Pontifices & reges differentia.*

i 25. q. 1. Generali.

k Decretal. de hæret. cap. ad abolendam.

l Extrauag. de offic. delegati cap. Sedes Apoſtolica, & paſſim.

m *Certius & ſine periculo eſt ſuſtinere adimpletionem prophetiæ.*

n Apoc. 13. 18.

o Apoc. 17. 9. 10.

beene said, the highest gouernour of state. Wee know also by experience, that a King taketh his name of the countrie, or place, or state whereof he is king. Thus are we wont to name kings, *the king of England, the king of Denmarke, the French king, the Spanish king.* We must therefore conceiue likewise, that Antichrist being a king, must take his name of his kingdome, of the city or countrey ouer which he raigneth. The place where Antichrist shall raigne, is set forth to be [p] *the City vpon seuen hils, raigning then ouer the Kings of the earth,* which is vndoubtedly the City of Rome. Antichrist therefore must haue his name from the inhabitants and people of Rome ouer whom hee is to raigne, and the name that hee taketh from them, which is λατινος *Latine* or *Romane*, fully expresseth the number sixe hundred, sixty, sixe. But to giue vs yet further light, it is noted that he shall be [q] *the seuenth King of the Latines*, and hee shall bee together with [r] *the ten Kings*, to which the Empire of Rome shall be diuided. The sixt king of the Latines wee haue before seene was the Emperour. So then after the fall of the Emperour, and dissolution of the Empire, *the Latine king* shall be the certaine and vndoubted name of Antichrist, neither are wee to make any question, but that hee is Antichrist whosoeuer is Lord and king of the Roman state. But that the Pope hath euer since beene; and therefore doth *Turrian* the Iesuite call the Popedome, [s] *the kingdome of the Romanes*, and *Nauarre* the Canonist termeth the Pope [t] *regem Latinorum, the king of the Latines or Romans*; and it hath beene before shewed, that hee wholly challengeth to himselfe the right and title thereof. The Pope therefore without all doubt is Antichrist; and we know him so to bee, because after the Emperour hee is become the *Latine or Roman king*, vnder the name of the *Latine or Romane Bishop*, by which hee is renoumed through the whole world. And because we see that *the seuenth king of the Latines* is not one onely man, but a succession of many, as in the other gouernments before, therefore wee know that it was not meant that Antichrist should be one onely man, but a succession of many in one gouernment of the Romane state. Which is the thing wherein *Irenaus* erred, being deceiued as it seemeth by the traditions of *Papias*, by meanes whereof, both he himselfe, and others after him by his example more readily entertained sundry fables concerning Antichrist, the pretence whereof the Papists now abuse

to

p ver. 9. 18.

q verse 9. 10.

r verse 18.

s Turrian de eccles. & ordinat. minist. lib. 1. cap. 2. Regnum Romanorum.

t Nauar. Manual. Confessar. in epist. dedicat. ad Gregor. 13.

to make men looke for another Antichrist, and not to know him whom the Scripture hath described so to be.

## W. Bishop.

*Thus come we at length to the end of* M. Perkins *proofes, and reproofes in his prologue, where we finding little fidelitie in his allegations of the fathers, bad construction and foule ouersight in the text of holy Scripture, briefly great malice, but slender force against the Church of Rome, we are to returne the words of his theame to all good Christians.* Go out of her my people. *Forsake the enemies of the Romane Church. And as our Ancestors did the Pagan Emperours, who drew out her most pure bloud, so let vs flie in matters of faith and religion, from all heretikes that of late also spared not to shed abundance of the same most innocent bloud, vnlesse to your greater condemnation, you had leifer* be partakers of her sinnes, and receiue of her plagues. *And because I purpose (God willing) not onely to confute what* M. Perkins *bringeth against the Catholike doctrine, but some what also in euery Chapter to fortifie and confirme it: I will here deliuer what some of the most ancient, most learned, and most holy Fathers doe teach, concerning ioyning with the Church, and* Pope *of Rome, from whose societie Protestants labour tooth and naile to withdraw vs. And because of this we must treat more amply in the questions of supremacie, I will vse here their authoritie onely whom* M. Perkins *citeth against vs.* S. Bernard *is cited already;* S. Irenæus *Scholer of* S. Policarpe, *and he of* S. Iohn *the Euangelist, of the Church of Rome writeth thus.* To this Church, by reason of her more mightie principalitie, it is necessarie that euerie Church, that is, the faithfull on all sides, do condescend and agree; in and by which, alwaies the tradition of the Apostles hath been preserued by them that be round about her. *Lib. 3. cap. 3.*

*Saint* Ierome *writing to* Damasus Pope *of Rome, saith*: I following none as chiefest but Christ, do in participation ioyne with thy blessednesse, *that is,* with the chaire of *Peter*, I knowe the Church to be builded vpon that Rocke. Whosoeuer doth eate the *Paschal Lambe* out of this house, is a profane fellow, hee that is not found within the Arke of *Noe*, shall when the flouds arise perish: *And a little after,* I know not *Vitalis*, I refuse *Meletius*, I take no notice of *Paulinus*: he that gathereth not with thee, scattereth; *that is,* he that

that is not with Christ, is with Antichrist.

*Marke and embrace this most learned Doctors iudgement, of ioyning with the See of Rome, in all doubtfull questions: he would not trust to his owne wit and skill, which were singular; nor thought it safe to rely vpon his learned and wise neighbours: he durst not set vp his rest with his owne Bishop* Paulinus, *who was a man of no meane marke but the Patriarke of Antioch: but made his assured stay vpon the See of Rome, as vpon an vnmoueable Rocke, with which (saith he) of we do not communicate in faith and Sacraments, we are but prophane men, voide of all Religion: In a word, we belong to Christ, but be of Antichrists traine. See, how flat contrarie this most holy ancient Father is to* M. Perkins. M. Perkins *would make vs of Antichrists band, because we cleaue vnto the Bishop of Rome. Whereas* S. Hierome *holdeth all to appertaine to Antichrist, who be not fast knocked in matters of Religion, with the* Pope *and See of Rome. And so to conclude with this point, euery true Catholike must say with* S. Ambrose: I desire in all things to follow the Church of Rome. *And thus much of his prologue. Afterward he taketh vpon him to prescribe and shewe vs how farre forth wee may ioyne with the Church of Rome, by proposing many points in controuersie betweene vs and them, and in each shewing in what points we consent together, and in what we differ. I meane by Gods grace to follow him step by step, although he hath made many a disorderly one, as well to discouer his deceits, and to disproue their errors, as also to establish the Catholike doctrine, the which I will endeuour to performe (by the helpe of God) with all simplicitie of language, and with as much breuitie as such a weighty matter will permit. Yet (I hope) with that perspicuitie, as the meaner learned may vnderstand it, and with such substance of proofe, both out of the holy Scriptures and ancient Fathers, as the more iudicious (to whose profit it is principally dedicated) may not contemne it.*

*Lib. 3. de Sacra. cap. 9.*

R. Abbot.

What the dealing of *M. Perkins* and *M. Bishop* on each part hath been, I leaue it to the Reader to iudge by examining of both, who I doubt not will acknowledge *M. Perkins* fidelitie of allegations, true construction of holy Scriptures, and sufficient argument to make all men iealous of the Church of Rome. And seeing *Hierom*

of

of old hath giuen light (as before hath been ſhewed) that of Rome it is ſaid, *Go out of her my people*, and there can be thenceforth no other Rome, to which we may apply it, but onely the corrupted ſtate of the Church of Rome: therefore he will take it (I preſume) as a warning from God, to take heed of, and to eſchue the filthie fornications, idolatries, and abominations of that vncleane ſtrumpet, and will deride the fillineſſe of thoſe collections, whereby *M. Biſhop* laboureth to perſwade the contrarie. As for that which he ſaith of vs vnder the name of *heretikes*, that *of late we ſpared not to ſhed abundance of their moſt innocent bloud*, it ſetteth forth the ſingular impudencie, and remorſeleſſe malice of theſe notorious hypocrites. For whereas he talketh of *abundance of bloud*, he well knoweth, that in fiue and fortie yeares of Queene *Elizabeth*, there was not ſo much bloud of theirs ſhed by vs, as was of ours by them in fiue yeares of the raigne of Queene *Mary*. And whereas he calleth it *innocent bloud*, they themſelues, *M. Biſhop* I meane, and his fellow Seculars, by their Proctor [a] *Watſon*, haue cleared the State, as hauing iuſt cauſe to proceed againſt the that were put to death; againſt the Ieſuites as immeditate actors of treaſon, againſt the Prieſts as being employed by them for the effecting thereof. It pleaſed God by that quarrell of theirs againſt the Ieſuites, to make them witneſſes of the innocencie of the State in the ſhedding of their bloud: and by their owne mouth to make it knowne, that the Ieſuits were ſtill deuiſing & practiſing for the death of the Queen, and for the ruine and ouerthrow of the Realm, and that the Prieſts were vſed by them as inſtruments for the compaſſing and atchieuing of their traiterous deſignes, ſo that the nature of their fact could be no leſſe then treaſon: and therefore what conſcience may we thinke there is in this leud hireling, contrarie to their owne cõfeſſion, to renew a complaint againſt the State, of ſhedding innocent bloud, as if there had been no cauſe but meerely Religion towards God, why they were put to death? But if that had beene the quarrell, many more would haue been in like ſort to be touched, being openly knowne to be profeſſers of that Religion, who notwithſtanding as we know, ſaue only for a pecuniarie mulct for treſpaſſing the law, liued at their owne libertie, and fully with vs enioyed the benefit of the State. To let this paſſe, *M. Biſhop* will now tel vs ſomwhat out of the Fathers, to warrant our ioyning with the

[a] *Watſon Quodlibet.*

Church and Pope of Rome. He hath alledged *S. Bernard* before, and he is anſwered before. Further, he bringeth *Irenæus*, ſaying: [b] *To this Church by reaſon of the more mightie principalitie, it is neceſſarie that euery Church, that is, the faithfull on all ſides do agree, in which the tradition which is from the Apoſtles, hath been alwaies preſerued of them that are about her.* Which words he alledgeth, but drawes no direct concluſion from them, nor indeed can do, but by begging that which is in queſtion betwixt vs. It was neceſſarie in the time of *Irenæus*, that euery Church ſhold accord to the Church of Rome, becauſe therein the tradition and true doctrine of the Apoſtles had been faithfully preſerued: but will *M. Biſhop* hereof ſimply conclude, that it is now alſo neceſſarie for euery Church to accord with the Church of Rome? It is a queſtion now, whether ſhe retaine the doctrine and tradition of the Apoſtles: nay it is out of queſtion that ſhe doth not ſo, & therfore her former commendation, is no argument, that we ſhould approue her now. Ieruſalem was [c] *the citie which the Lord did chuſe to place his name there.* She was *a faithfull citie*, and ſo long neceſſarie it was, that all other cities ſhould conforme themſelues to her. But [d] *of a faithfull citie* ſhe became *a harlot*, and departed ſo far from her former ſteps, as that ſhe crucified the Sonne of God, and killed his Saints, and in the end it was ſaid of her by a voyce from God, as *Ioſephus* recordeth, [e] *Migremus hinc: Let vs depart from hence.* So the Church of Rome was a Virgin, the chaſt & faithful ſpouſe of Chriſt, continuing ſtedfaſtly in the doctrine by which ſhe firſt became the Church of Rome, & ſo long as ſhe ſo continued, it was neceſſarie for all Churches to accord with her, as for her to accord with all other Churches that had done the like. But ſhe is ſince become an vncleane filth, proſtituted to all maner of fornications, embrued & drunken with the bloud that ſhe hath ſpilt, ſo that now the voyce of God calleth to vs in like ſort concerning her, *Go out of her my people.* Neither hath *M. Biſhop* any better helpe by that that he will further alledge, that *Irenæus* mentioneth *a potent principalitie* of that Church. For that *potent principalitie* was not intended by *Irenæus* for any ſupremacie of the Church of Rome, but imported onely an honour yeelded vnto it in reſpect of the imperiall ſtate of the Citie of Rome; which we know men of inferior townes are wont to yeeld to them that are of high & honorable cities, only for the preheminēce of the place.

But

b *Iren. lib. 3. ca. 3. Ad hanc Eccleſiam propter potentiorem principalitatem neceſſe eſt omnem conuenire Eccleſiam hoc eſt, eos qui ſunt vndiq; fideles, in qua ſemper ab his qui ſunt vndique conſeruata eſt ea quæ eſt ab Apoſtolis traditio.*

c 2. Chron 6.6.

d Eſa. 1. 21.

e *Ioſeph. de bello Iudaico. li. 7. c. 12*

But if the Church of Rome had had any such *potent principality* as *M. Bishop* intendeth in respect whereof all other Churches should yeeld subiection and obedience vnto her, then would not [f] *Polycarpus* the Bishop of Smyrna haue refused to yeeld to *Anicetus* the Bishop of Rome in matters of difference betwixt them, as *Irenaus* sheweth he did before his time: neither would [g] *Polycrates* the Bishop of Ephesus and Metropolitan of the *Asian* Churches haue resisted *Victor* in the time of *Ireneus*; neither would [h] *Cyprian* haue contradicted *Stephanus*, neither would *Aurelius* and *Austin* and the rest of the Fathers in the Councell of Carthage, haue [i] withstood the claime of the Bishop of Rome for authority to receiue appeales made from them to him: neither would those fixe hundred and thirty Bishops in the Chalcedon Councell, haue yeelded to the Patriarch of Constantinople, according to a former decree of a Councell of [k] Constantinople, an equality of priuiledge and prerogatiue with the Bishop of Rome. The matter is very plaine. [l] *The Fathers*, say they, *haue yeelded preuiledges to the sea of old Rome, because that was the Imperiall City. And the hundred and fifty Bishops* (of the Councell of Constantinople) *being moued with the same consideration haue yeelded equall priuiledges to the sacred sea of new Rome*, (that is, Constantinople) *rightly iudging, that the City which is honoured with the Empire and Senate, and enioyeth equall preuiledges with olde Rome, should also in Ecclesiasticall matters be no lesse extolled and magnified then it is, being the next vnto it.* Thus they acknowledge the Principalitie of the Church of Rome to be nothing else, but in respect that that City was the seat of the Empire, and therefore Constantinople, being become the seat of the Empire, and in respect thereof being called *new Rome*, they gaue to the Church of Constantinople equall dignity and principality with the Church of Rome, leauing to the Bishop of Rome onely precedence of name and place. The Legates of the Bishop of Rome would faine haue had it otherwise, but *the whole Councell approued the decree.* Now by that that hath beene said to *Irenaus*, the answer is plaine to that that *M. Bishop* further citeth out of *Hrome.* The true faith and doctrine of the Godhead of Christ, was then maintained by the Church of Rome against the remainder of the infection and poyson of the Arian heresie. Hereupon *Hierome* writeth to *Damasus* Bishop of Rome, to be aduertised of the vse of some words that

f *Iren. apud Euseb. hist. eccles. lib. 5. cap. 23.*
g *Ibid. cap. 22. & Hieron. in Catal. Script. Eccl. in Polycrate.*
h *Cypr. ad Pompeium contra Epist. Stephani.*
i *Concil. Carth. 6. & Aphrican. cap. 101. &c.*
k *Conc. Constantinop. 1 cap. 2*
l *Concil. Chalcedon Act. 15. cap. 28. Antiquæ Romæ throno quod vrbs illa imperaret iure Patres priuilegia tribuere. Et eadē consideratione moti 150. Dei omnipotentissimi Episcopi sanctissimo nouæ Romæ throno æqualia priuilegia tribuere, recte iudicantes vrbem quæ imperio & Senatus honorata sit, & æqualibus cum antiquissima Roma priuilegijs fruatur, etiam in rebus ecclesiasticis non secus ac illam extolli & magnificari, secundam post illam existentem.*

concerned that point. He commendeth the Church of Rome, [m] *for that the inheritance of the Fathers* (that is, the true faith) *was preſerued vncorrupt with them onely*. For this cauſe doth he bind himſelfe to the communion and fellowſhip of *Damaſus*. *Vpon the rocke* of that faith which the church of Rome ſtill held, he knew the Church to be built. In reſpect of this faith, he that went out of that *houſe*, that is, left the communion of that Church, becauſe thereby he renounced the truth, he became prophane. In the ſame reſpect, he that gathered not with *Damaſus*, being a maintainer of the true faith, he muſt needes be a ſcatterer. He could not be of Chriſt that refuſed them that tooke part with Chriſt, and therefore muſt bee of Antichriſt. In this reſpect he renounced *Vitalis*, *Meleſius*, and *Paulinus*, becauſe [n] they were all either knowne or ſuſpected to be partakers of the hereſie of *Arius*, and therefore very deceitfully doth *M. Biſhop* alleadge, that *hee would not ſet vp his reſt with his owne Biſhop Paulinus, who was no meane man, but the Patriarch of Antioch*: as heereby to adde a ſuperiority to the Biſhop of Rome, when as there was otherwiſe ſo apparant cauſe, why he ſhould refuſe ſo to doe. In all this therefore *Hierome* ſaith no more of the Biſhop and Church of Rome, then he might haue ſaid of any other Biſhop and Church, profeſſing true faith and Doctrine, as the Church of Rome then did: but very farre was he from teaching or intending any perpetuall neceſſity, that all Churches for euer ſhould conforme themſelues to the Church of Rome. And that hee neuer had any ſuch meaning, let it appeare by himſelfe, when being vrged with the example of the Church of Rome, hee anſwereth: [o] *What doſt thou bring to me the cuſtome of one City? why doſt thou maintaine a paucity (or fewneſſe) whence hath growne proud vſurping vpon the lawes of the Church*? He had ſaid a little before, [p] *If we demand authority, the world is greater then the city. Whereſoeuer a Biſhop be, whether of Rome, or of Eugubium; whether at Conſtantinople, or at Rhegium; whether at Alexandria, or at Tanes, he is of the ſame worth, and of the ſame office of Biſhopricke. Power of wealth, or baſeneſſe of pouerty, maketh a Biſhop neither higher nor lower, but they are all ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles*. Thus he ſpake purpoſely in derogation of the Church of Rome, charging the ſame with proud domineering ouer the lawes of the Church: affirming the authority of the Churches through the world, to be greater then the authority of the Church of Rome: attri-

m *Hieron. ad Damaſum. Apud vos ſolos incorrupta Patrum ſeruatur hereditas.*

n *Eraſm. ſchol. ibid.*

o *Hieron Epiſt. ad Enagr. Quid mihi profers vnius vrbis conſuetudinem? quid paucitatem de qua ortum eſt ſupercilium in leges Eccleſiæ vindicas?*

p *Ibid. Si auctoritas quæritur, orbis maior eſt vrbe. Vbicunque fuerit Epiſcopus, ſiue Romæ, ſiue Eugubij, ſiue Conſtantinopoli, ſiue Rhegij, ſiue Alexandriæ, ſiue Tanis, eiuſdem meriti eſt, eiuſdē ſacerdotij. Potentia diuitiarum, & paupertatis humilitas ſublimem vel inferiorem Epiſcopum non facit, cæterùm omnes Apoſtolorū ſucceſſores ſunt.*

attributing to euery Biſhop of whatſoeuer place, equallie in office with the Biſhop of Rome, becauſe all are alike ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles. Yea and to ſhew that the Church of Rome receiued no more by *Peter*, then other Churches did by the reſt of the Apoſtles, he ſaith in another place: that [q] *the Church is built vpon all the Apoſtles, and they all receiue the keyes of the kingdome of heauen; and the ſtrength of the Church is equally grounded vpon them*. Whereby it plainely appeareth, that *Hierome* neuer meant to make the Church of Rome any ſuch perpetuall Miſtris and ruler of other Churches, as *M. Biſhop* dreameth her to be. Yea but *S. Ambroſe* further ſaith: *I deſire in all things to follow the Church of Rome*. But why did *M. Biſhop* giue ouer there, & not adde alſo that that followeth: [r] *I deſire* (ſaith he) *in all things to follow the Church of Rome: but yet we are alſo men that haue vnderſtanding: and therefore what is more rightly obſerued otherwhere, we alſo iuſtly obſerue the ſame*. *S. Ambroſe* being Biſhop of Millaine not farre from Rome ſheweth, that he yeelded a reuerend reſpect vnto the Church of Rome, but yet profeſſeth, that things might be better in other places then they were at Rome, and that his Church of Millaine had vnderſtanding to iudge what was fit aſwell as the church of Rome, and therefore that they held not themſelues tyed by any neceſſarie dutie to the example thereof, but would do what they thought more rightly performed in any other Church. Now then what ſhall we thinke of *M. Biſhop*, who thus ſhamefully ſeeketh to blind his reader, by alledging one part of a ſentence for his purpoſe, when the other part thereof expreſly croſſeth that for which he alledgeth it? And thus much concerning *M. Biſhops* anſwere to *M. Perkins* Prologue. For the reſt I will (God willing) follow him in like ſort *ſteppe by ſteppe*, according to his owne words, in more honeſt and faithfull manner then he hath dealt with *M. Perkins*, and that in ſuch ſort I hope as that *the meaner learned* ſhall vnderſtand that the learning which he would teach them is naught, and *the more iudicious* ſhall be able to iudge, that it is a very bad cauſe, to which *the marrow and pith of many large volumes* can yeeld no better defence then he hath brought.

[q] *Idem adu. Iouinian. lib. 1. Aſt dicis ſuper Petrum fundatur Eccleſia: licet idipſum in alio loco ſuper omnes Apoſtolos fiat, & cunctis claues regni cælorum accipiant, & ex aquo ſuper eos Eccleſia fortitudo ſolidatur.*

[r] *Ambroſ. de Sacram. l. 3. cap. 1. In omnibus cupio ſequi Romanam Eccleſiam, ſed tamen & nos homines ſenſum habemus: ideò quod alibi rectiùs ſeruatur, & nos rectè cuſtodimus.*

## Chapter. 1.

# OF FREE WILL.

### 1. W. Bisshop.

THat I be not thought captious, but willing to admit any thing that M. Perkins hath ſayd agreeable to the truth, I will let his whole text in places indifferent, paſſe, paring off onely ſuperfluous words, with adding ſome annotations where it ſhall be needfull, and reſt onely vpon the points in controuerſie. First then concerning Free will, wherewith he beginneth, thus he ſaith: Free will both by them and vs, is taken for a mixt power in the minde and will of man, whereby diſcerning what is good, and what is euill, he doth accordingly chuſe or refuſe the ſame.

Annot. *If we would ſpeake formally, it is not a mixt power in the mind and will, but is a free faculty of the mind and will onely, whereby we chuſe or refuſe, ſuppoſing in the vnderſtanding, a knowledge of the ſame before. But let this definition paſſe as more popular.*

M. Perkins. 1. Concluſion. *Man muſt be conſidered in a foure-fold eſtate, as he was created, as he was corrupted, as he is renued, as he ſhall be glorified. In the firſt ſtate we aſcribe vnto mans will libertie of nature, in which he could will or nill either good or euill*; note that this libertie proceeded not from his owne nature, but of originall Iuſtice, in which he was created. *In the third libertie of grace, in the laſt libertie of glorie.*

Annot. *Carry this in mind, thus here he graunteth man in the ſtate of grace to haue Free will.*

### R. Abbot.

MAiſter *Bishop* here dealeth as iuglers are wont to do, who make ſhew of faire play, when they vſe nothing but leger-demaine. He will not *be thought captious*, and yet for two whole pages here in the beginning, is nothing but captious. His letting the text of *M. Perkins* his booke *ſo paſſe whole in places indifferent*, is nothing

nothing but a dismembring and mangling of the text. His *paring off onely of superfluous words*, is the paring off of such arguments and authorities as he knew not how to answer. His adding of *annotations*, the sophisticating of his reader with idle and friuolous corrections. His *resting onely vpon points of controuersie*, the wresting of those things to controuersie whereof there is no controuersie at all. *M. Perkins* defineth *Free will* to be *a mixt power of the minde and will of man, whereby esteeming what is good and what is euill, he doth accordingly chuse or refuse the same.* A little to please himselfe hee giueth a snach at this definition of *Free will*, as not formall enough, onely to shew himselfe more formall then wise; the definition being more fitly expressed then that which he hath put in place of it, and he honestly is content, because it is *more popular*, to let it passe. Whereas *M. Perkins* in his first conclusion, affirmeth in the first estate of man as he was created, *a libertie of nature*, *M. Bishop* giueth thereof this learned note: *that this libertie proceeded not from mans owne nature, but from originall iustice wherein he was created*, as if he should say, that the shining of the Sunne proceedeth not from the nature of the Sunne, but from the light of it; whereas the light is a part of the nature of the Sunne, as was original iustice a part of the nature of man, being the [a] *image and likenesse of God*, in which and according to which he was created. And to say that *Free will* did proceed from *originall iustice*, is wholy against himselfe, because it must thereof follow, that in the fall of *originall iustice*, must needs be implied the losse of *Free will*, which cannot stand without that from which it doth proceed, so that man in his fall must necessarily be sayd to haue lost his *Free will*. But he should rather haue sayd, that God gaue vnto man *Free will*, as the *steward* and disposer of originall iustice and righteousnesse, and as [b] *the ballance* to turne either to or fro, *the benefit that God had put into the hands and power of man.*

[a] Ephes. 4. 24.

[b] *Tertul. aduersus Marcion. lib. 2. Libertas & potestas arbitrij quæ sibi gens emancipati de Deo bona.*

In the third estate of man, *as he is renewed*, *M. Perkins* affirmeth *libertie of grace*. *Carry this in minde*, saith *M. Bishop*, *that here he grant eth man in the state of grace to haue Free will.* As though either he, or any of vs had made question thereof, who all acknowledge by the Gospell that it is the worke of Christ [c] *to make vs free*, [d] *free from sinne*, [e] *free from the bondage of corruption*, that in holinesse we may bee seruants vnto God. Nay that the reader may the more

[c] John 8. 36.
[d] Rom. 6. 18.
[e] Gap. 8. 21.

cleerely conceiue the truth of this whole matter, we deny not *Free will* in any estate of man. For it is true which S. *Austin* saith, [f] *that what soeuer we will, we will the same by Free will*, because the will is not subiect to compulsion, but willeth alwaies freely, and of it owne accord, or else looseth the nature and name of *will*. Which *freedome of will*, by originall institution stood indifferent either to good or euill; yet was not to continue so, but vpon election once made to be free onely in that whereto of it selfe it should betake it selfe: free onely in euill, if it should apply it selfe to euill: free only in good, if it should make choyce to continue therein. Therefore the Angels which kept their originall habitation and estate, haue their [g] *Free will* by Gods election and grace stablished in goodnes, so that it is not inclineable to any thing that is euill. But the Angels which sinned and abode not in the truth, haue their Free will by it selfe, and of it selfe [h] obdured and hardened in that that is euill, so that it is not at all appliable to any thing that is good. Man therefore by sinne hath not lost *Free will*, for by [i] *Free will* it is *that now he sinneth*, yea and *can nothing but sinne*. But this *Free will* that is thus *free* in sinne, hath no freedome at all, as S. *Austin* in sundry places expresseth, to righteousnesse, and to the seruice of God, vntill it bee rectified and made free by Iesus Christ; no freedome or power at all, but what is newly and meerely [k] *the grace and gift of God*. Therfore hauing affirmed the *freedome* of the will to sinne, hee addeth that [l] *to righteousnesse, but as it is made free and helped of God, it auaileth not hing*. [m] *What telleſt thou me of Free will*, saith hee, *which to the doing of righteousnesse shall not be free, except thou become a sheepe of Gods? he then who of men maketh his sheepe, euen he maketh the wils of men Free to the obedience of godlinesse*. [n] *We lost free will to loue God by the greatnesse of the first sinne*, saith hee, *but by grace our will is made free to decline from euill and doe good*. So then we doe not deny *Free will* to be righteousnesse, but yet we haue regard to that caution which S. *Austin* giueth against Pelagians and Papists, [o] *if wee will defend Free will aright, not to oppugne that whence it is made free*. What [p] *doth a man denie Free will*, saith hee, *because he attributeth it*

[f] *Augustin. de ciuit. dei, lib. 5. cap. 10. Necesse est esse vt cùm volumus libero vtimur arbitrio.*

[g] *Bernard. de grat. & lib. arb. Angelis sanctis ita sunt bona vt non possint esse & mala.*

[h] *Ibid. prauicatores angeli ita sunt mali vt iam non valeant esse boni.*

[i] *Augustin. cont. 2. epist. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 2. Liberum arbitrium vsque adeo in peccatore non perijt vt per illud peccent, maximè omnes qui cum delectatione peccant, & lib. 3. ca. 8. Non nisi ad peccatum valet.*

[k] *Idem de pecat. mer. & rem. lib. 2. cap. 6. Ipsum liberum arbitrium ad dei gratiam hoc est ad Dei dona pertinere non ambigens, &c.*

[l] *Cont. 2. epist. Pelag. l. 3. cap. 8. Ad iustitiam nisi diuinitus liberatum adiutumque non valet.*

[m] *Ibid. lib. 4. ca. 3. Quid mihi obiectis liberum arbitrium, quod ad faciendam iustitiam liberum non erit, nisi ouis fuerit? Qui fit igitur omnes homines ipse ad obedientiam pietatis humanus liberat voluntates.*

[n] *Epist. 107. Liberum arbitrium ad diligendum Deum primi peccati grauitate perdidimus: & antea: Gratia nostrum ad declinandum à malo & faciendum bonum liberatur arbitrium.*

[o] *Ibid. si verè volumus defendere liberum arbitrium non oppugnemus vnde sit liberum.*

[p] *Cont. 2. ep. Pelag. l. 4. cap. 9. Numquid liberum arbitrium negat hominibus quia Deo totum tribuit quod recte viuimus?*

wholly

wholy to God that we liue well: q without freedome of will we cannot liue well; for how should a man do well without his will?) but yet this *Free will* to liue well *is* r *a will* not *free* (meerely & of it selfe) *but made free by the grace of God.* For then is r *the will of man free indeed, when it is free from sinne: and such a free will God gaue to man in the beginning, but he lost it by his owne default, and being lost it cannot be restored, but by him that was able first to giue it.* In Christ therefore it is restored vnto vs, who by his s *free spirit* giueth t *libertie to the captiues, and openeth the prison to them that are bound,* and u *deliuereth vs from the power of darknesse*, and maketh vs x *free men vnto him.* But yet so, as that hauing receiued but a *the first fruits of the spirit*, by whom this freedome is wrought, according to the words of the Apostle, b *Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is libertie*, the same is yet but begun in vs, so that c *there is partly freedome, and partly bondage, not yet whole and pure and perfect freedome.* For no further is the will *freed* then it is renewed; and it is renewed as yet but in part, continuing still d *in part in the old estate.* Therefore it is so made *free*, as that in some part we haue cause still to complain with the Apostle, e *I am carnall, sold vder sinne*, and to pray with the Prophet *Dauid*: f *Bring my soule out of prison, that I may giue thankes vnto thy name.* Hence is that heauinesse and dulnesse, that waywardnesse and vntowardnesse, that retention and holding backe, that still we find in vs in the applying of our selues to spirituall and heauenly things. And as touching that wherein we are renewed and made free, it is not sufficient to vphold vs and keepe vs in the right way, but we haue still neede of the grace of God, to be assistant and helpefull vnto vs. g *It is not enough that God hath once giuen*, sayth *Hierome*, *except he still giue: I pray to receiue, and when I haue receiued, I pray againe.* Therefore the ancient church required of *Pelagius* to confesse, that h *the grace of God is giuen vs to euerie act that we do.* i *He preuenteth vs to make vs willing, & followeth vs when we are willing, that we do not will in vaine.* And if his hand do not hold vs and vphold vs, it commeth to passe by the burden of corruptible flesh, that we are still relapsing to our

q *Retract. lib. 1. cap. 9. Tale est, vt sine illo recte uiuere nequeamus.*
r *Conf. 2. epist. Pelag. lib. 3. cap. 7. Hominis non libera sed Dei gratia liberata voluntas.*
s *De ciuit. Dei. lib. 4. cap. 11. Abutitur voluntatis tunc est vere liberum, cùm vitijs peccatisque non seruit. Tale datum est à Deo quod amissum proprio vitio, nisi à quo dati potuit reddi non potest.*
t *Psal. 51. 12.*
u *Esa. 61. 1.*
x *Col. 1. 13.*
y *1. Cor. 7. 22.*
a *Rom. 8. 23.*
b *2. Cor. 3. 17.*
c *August. in Ioan. tract. 41. Ex parte liberatus, ex parte seruitur; nondum tota, nondum pura, nondum plena libertas.*
d *De peccat. mer. & rem. lib. 2. cap. 7. Animus qui est homo interior nondum totus est renouatus, & in quantùm nondum est renouatus, in tantum adhuc in veteri statu est.*
e *Rom. 7. 14.*
f *Psal. 142. 7.*
g *Hieron. ad Ctesiphont. Non sufficit mihi quòd semel donauit, nisi semper donauerit: Peto vt accipiam, & cùm accepero rursùm peto.*
h *August. epist. 106. Fateatur gratiam Dei & adiutorium eius ad singulos actus dari.*
i *Enchirid. cap. 32. Nolentem præuenit vt velit; volentem subsequitur ne frustra velit.*

selues,

k Exod. 14. 11. 12.

l Bernard. in Cant. ser. 84. Non est aliud anima nostra quam spiritus vadens & non rediens, si sibi fuerit derelicta.

selues, and still readie with the kIsraelite to yeeld our selues to become bond againe. l *Our soule*, saith Bernard, *is no other but as a wind that passeth and returneth not againe, if it be left vnto it selfe.* Now *M. Bishop* do you carry this in mind, thus expressed by the phrases and speeches of the ancient Church, and leaue to calumniate our doctrine, who affirme *Free will* as farre as they affirmed it, and deny it no otherwise but as they denied it against the Pelagian heretikes. But you will hardly leaue your wont, because you see well enough, that if you take our doctrine as we deliuer it, you can deuise nothing plausibly or colourably to speake against it.

## 2. W. Bisshop.

M. Per. 2. Conclusion. *The matters whereabout Free will is occupied, are principally the actions of men, whichbe of three sorts;* Naturall, Humane, Spirituall. Naturall actions *are such, as are common to men and beasts, as to eate, sleepe, &c. In all which we ioyne with the Papists, and hold that man hath free will euen since the fall of* Adam.

M. Per. 3. Conclusion. Humane actions *are such, as are common to all men, good and bad, as to speake, to practise any kind of art, to performe any kind of ciuill dutie, to preach, to administer Sacraments, &c. And hither we may referre the outward actions of ciuill vertues, as namely Iustice, Temperance, Gentlenesse, and Liberalitie, and in these also we ioyne with the Church of Rome, and say (as experience teacheth) that men haue a naturall freedome of will, to put them, or not to put them in execution.* S. Paul *saith,* The Gentiles that haue not the law, do the things of the law by nature, *that is, by naturall strength: And he saith of him selfe, that before his conuersion touching the righteousnesse of the law, he was vnblameable. And for this externall obedience, naturall men receiue reward in temporall things. And yet here some caueats must be remembred.*

Rom. 2. 14.

Phil. 3. 6.

Mat. 6. 5.

Ezech. 29. 19.

*First, that in humane actions (he should say morall) mans will is weake, and his vnderstanding dimme, therevpon he often failes in them. This caueat is no caueat of the Protestants, but taken out of* S. Thomas *of* Aquines. *And in all such actions with* S. Augustine, *(you might haue quoted the place) I vnderstand the will of man, to be onely wounded*

Summe. 2. 2. q. 109. art. 4. & 8.

*ded or halfe dead.*

2. *That the will of man, is vnder the will of God, and therefore to be ordered by it:* Who knowes not this?

R. ABBOT.

Here *M. Bishop* giueth vs some more of his learned notes, and telleth vs, that *M. Perkins* for *humane* should haue said *morall*, whereas the name of *morall actions* doth not so properly comprehend all those which he meant to import by *humane actions*. As touching the first *caueat* giuen to the third conclusion, that *in humane actions mans will is weake, and his vnderstanding dimme, &c.* he noteth that *this caueat is no caueat of the Protestants, but taken out of S. Thomas of Aquines*. He was desirous it seemeth to haue it thought, that he had looked into *Thomas Aquinas*, but he was willing withal to shew that he did not well vnderstand what he read there: for he that looketh into [a] the places which he quoteth, shall easily see, that there was little cause for him to say, that that is a caueat taken out of *Thomas Aquinas*, there being nothing directly tending to the matter of the caueat expressed by *M. Perkins*. But the Protestants might wel learn that caueat out of their owne experience, and if we had not obserued it of our selues, we could haue learned it of Philosophers, and Poets, and Historians, to say nothing of ecclesiasticall Writers, so that we neede not to seeke to *Thomas Aquinas* to borrow it from him. But what is that to the purpose, seeing we professe our selues well content *legere Margaritas ex cano, to gather Pearles euen out the dirt*, and from *M. Bishop* himselfe to take knowledge of any thing worthy our learning, if any thing worthy our learning had bin writ-tē by him. *M. Perkins* saith, that *in humane or morall actions, with Austin he vnderstandeth the will of man only wounded or halfe dead. M. Bishop* saith, *he should haue quoted the place*: the place to which *M. Perkins* alludeth, I take it to be *Hypognost. lib. 3.* where *Austine* saith that man was *wounded and halfe dead*, [b] *because his Free will had still vitall motion, but he was wounded in the ornaments of morall actions, and lost the benefite of the possibilitie of Free will, to returne vnto euerlasting life*. To the other caueat, that *the will of man is vnder the will of God, and therefore to be ordered by it*, *M. Bishop* saith, *Who knowes not this?* As if men in deliuering precepts and rules of any kind of learning,

[a] *Thomas Aqui. 12. q. 109. art. 4. & 5.*

[b] *August. Hypognost. lib. 3. Recte dictus est semiuiuus: habebat enim vitalem motum, id est liberum arbitrium vulneratum (motum scilicet ornamentis, & bono possibilitatis liberi arbitrij perdito) quod est solum ad vitam æternam quam perdiderat reds e non sufficiebat.*

learning, did not ſet downe euen triuiall and common things, becauſe howſoeuer they be common, yet they be neceſſarie to make a perfect worke, and alwaies neceſſarie for learners, when the whole workes are needleſſe to them that are alreadie learned. And why might not *M. Perkins* bring in this *caueat* in a writing againſt the Papiſts, as well as *Hierome* did againſt the Pelagians? [c] *That we may know*, ſaith he, *that all things depend not vpon vs, but vpon the diſcretion and will of God, the Apoſtle ſaith, I will come vnto you ſpeedily, if the Lord will. When he ſaith, I will come vnto you, he ſheweth his good will, he declareth his deſire, he promiſeth his comming. But yet to ſpeake with a caueat, he ſaith, if the Lord will. Foi if any man thinke hee knoweth any thing, he knoweth not yet as he ought to know.* Yea and *S. Auſtine* alſo thought this point worth the noting againſt the ſame Pelagians, that [d] *the wils of men not onely for ſpirituall and eternall life, but as they concerne the preſerning of the creature of the world, are in the power of God, ſo as that he cauſeth them to incline whither hee will, and when he will, either for beneſite to ſome, or for puniſhment to other ſome.* And hee thought it not vnfitte to exemplifie this matter out of the [e] bookes of *Iosuah*, of the the Kings and Chronicles, how God ordereth the wils of men, for the conſtituting of earthly kingdomes, and maketh profitable vſe and application thereof, that it ſhould be abſurd [f] *to think that God frameth the wils of men for the ſetling of earthly kingdomes, and that men frame their owne wils for the obtaining of the kingdome of heauen.* And will *M. Biſhop* now turne off *Auſtine* and *Hierome*, as he doth *M. Perkins*, with *Who knowes not this?* But his notes yet are but to whet his wit: when hee is well awaked out of his ſleepe, haply we ſhall haue ſome wiſer ſtuffe.

[c] *Hieron. adu. Pelag. lib. 2. Vt ſciamus non ex nobis, ſed ex Dei cuncta pendere iudicio, veniam, inquit, &c. Qui enim dixit, veniã ad vos, oſtendit ſe velle, monſtrat cupere, promittit aduentum: ſed vt cautius hæc loquatur, infert: ſi Dominus voluerit. Si quis enim putat ſe quid noſſe, necdum nouit ſicut noſſe oportet.*

[d] *Auguſt. de grat. & lib. arbit. cap. 20. Scriptura oſtendit non ſolùm bonas hominum voluntates, &c. verumetiam quæ conſernat ſeculi creaturam ita eſſe in Dei poteſtate, vt eam quò voluerit, quando voluerit, faciat inclinari, &c.*

[e] *Ibid. cap. 20. 21.*

[f] *De Prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 10. Cogitate quale ſit, vt credamus ad conſtituenda regna terrena hominum voluntates operari Deum, & ad capeſſendum regnum cælorum homines operari voluntates ſuas.*

W. BISSHOP.

*M. P.* 4. Concluſion. *The third kind of actions are ſpirituall more neerely, and theſe bee twofold: good, or bad. In ſinnes we ioyne with the Papiſt, and teach that in ſinnes man hath freedome of will. Some perhaps will ſay, that we ſinne neceſſarilie, becauſe he that ſinneth, cannot but ſin, and that Free will and neceſſitie, cannot ſtand together. Indeed the neceſſitie of compulſion and Free will, cannot ſtand together, but there is another kind of neceſſity (or rather infallibilitie) which may ſtand with Free will: for ſome things may be done neceſſarilie, and alſo freely.*

Annot.

Annot. *The example of a close prisoner is not to the purpose, for it puts necessity in one thing, and liberty in another. The solution is, that necessarily must be taken for certainely, not that a man is at any time compelled to sinne, but his weakenesse and the craft of the diuell are such, that he is very often ouerreached by the diuell, and induced to sinne, but with free consent of his owne will.*

b *Augusti. de perfect. iustit. Rat. 9. Quia peccauit voluntas secuta est peccantem peccatum habendi dura necessitas.*

## R. Abbot.

The comparison of a prison vsed by *M. Perkins*, is most pregnant and fit. A man walketh vp and downe in close prison, and freelie moueth and stirreth himselfe; yet he hath no power to get out of prison, but for ought he can doe for himselfe is necessarily there. Euen so, man is free in sinne, and freely willeth whatsoeuer hee willeth thereto: but sinne is his prison, and hee cannot free himselfe therefrom; nay because the will it selfe is imprisoned, hee hath no will to be free, and therefore of necessity remaineth still a prisoner to sinne, till God doe change his will to make him free. But *M. Bishop* disliketh the comparison, *because it puts necessity in one thing, and liberty in another*, whereas to that purpose it was vsed, and to that purpose most fitly is applied, and therein nothing contained, but what is agreeable to the truth. For whereas he taketh vpon him to correct that terme of *necessity*, and will haue it to be called *infallibility and certainty*, he malepertly taketh vpon him to teach them that are more learned then himselfe. It is a word which *S. Austen* often vseth vpon the like occasion, both against the Pelagians and Manichees. [b] *Man sinned by his will*, saith he, *and thereupon followed a cruel necessity of hauing sinne.* [c] *A cruell necessity (of sinne) grew vpon our nature by the desert of the first sinne.* [d] *Not by creation, but by corruption of nature, there is a certaine necessity of committing sinne.* [e] *After that Adam sinned by free will, we were throwne headlong into a necessity (of sinne) all that haue descended of his race.* And that this necessity doth well stand with liberty, *S. Bernard* sheweth, in calling it [f] *a voluntary and mis-free necessity, wherein neither can necessitie excuse the will, because it is voluntary, nor the will exclude necessity, because it is entangled with delight therin; wherein will taketh from him all matter of defence, and necessity bereaueth him of possibility of amendment*, and in a word, *the will it selfe in strange wise causeth this necessity*

c *Retract. lib. 1. cap. 1: Naturæ nostræ dura necessitas meriti præcedentis inquisitis exorta est.*

d *De nat. & gra. cap. 66. Ex vitijs naturæ non ex conditione naturæ est quædam peccandi necessitas.*

e *Cont. Fortunat. disput. 2. Post quã libera ipsa voluntate peccauit, non in necessitatem præcipitati sumus.*

f *Bernard in Cantic. Ser. 81. Ipsa sibi voluntas necessitatẽ facit, vt nec necessitas cùm voluntaria sit excludere valeat voluntatem, nec voluntas cùm sua illecta excludere necessitatem: Et post: Anima sub voluntaria quadam & malè libera necessitate tenetur. Et iterum post. Voluntas inexcusabilem & incorrigibilem necessitatem facit.*

*neceſſity to it ſelfe*. Now then becauſe the ſtate of ſinne is ſuch, as that there is one way *neceſſity* by the habit of corruption, and another way *liberty* by the free motion of the will, very rightly did *M. Perkins* to expreſſe the ſame, vſe the example of a priſon, that *puts neceſſity in one thing, and liberty in another*. And thus in righteouſneſſe alſo *neceſſity* and *liberty* agree, and doe not one exclude the other. For the Angels being by the grace and power of God confirmed in goodneſſe, are thereby *neceſſarily good*, [g] *ſo and in ſuch ſort good, as that they cannot become euill*, and yet they are *freely and voluntarily* good, becauſe it is the will it ſelfe that is eſtabliſhed in goodneſſe. The ſame ſhall bee the ſtate of eternall life to the elect and faithfull, [h] *Bene viuendi & nunquam peccandi, voluntaria fœlixq; neceſſitas: A voluntarie and happy neceſſitie of liuing well & neuer ſinning any more*. Let *M. Biſhop* take knowledge now of this manner of ſpeech, and learne not to find fault when hee hath no cauſe. But he noteth, that wee muſt not vnderſtand, that *a man is at any time compelled to ſinne*: where I may anſwer him with his owne words before, *Who knowes not this?* And againe, that *this is none of M. Biſhops cauea; but taken out of M. Perkins*. *M. Perkins* had told him ſo much before hand, & therefore what needed this note? For *this neceſſitie* groweth not of any outward force, but from inward nature, not by condition of the ſubſtance, but by accidentall corruption, which being ſuppoſed, there is a neceſſitie of ſinne, as in the palſey a neceſſitie of ſhaking, in the hot feauer a neceſſitie of burning, in the broken legge a neceſſitie of halting, ſo continuing till the maladie and diſtemper be cured and done away. And whereas *M. Biſhop* referreth this *neceſſitie of ſinne to the weakneſſe of man, and to the craft of the diuell*, hee ſpeaketh too ſhort in the one, and impertinently in the other. For wee are not to conceiue *weakneſſe* onely, which may bee onelie a priuation, but a poſitiue euill habite and contagion of ſinne, whereby a man ſinneth euen without any furtherance of the diuels temptations, by the onely euill diſpoſition of himſelfe. Which euill diſpoſition, becauſe it is alſo in the will it ſelfe, therefore in the midſt of that neceſſitie, a man ſinneth no otherwiſe, but as *M. Biſhop* requireth to haue it ſaid, *with free conſent of his owne will*.

g *Idem. de grat. & lib. arbit. ſup.*

h *Auguſt. de perfect. Iuſtitia.*

W. Br-

W. Bisshop.

M.P. 5 Concluſion. *The ſecond kind of ſpirituall actions be good, as Repentance, Faith, Obedience, &c. In which we likewiſe in part ioyne with the Church of Rome, and ſay that in the firſt conuerſion of a ſinner, mans Free will concurreth with Gods grace, as a fellow or co-worker in ſome ſort. for in the conuerſion of a ſinner, three things are required: the word, Gods ſpirit, and mans will: for Mans will is not paſſiue in all and euery reſpect, but hath an action in the firſt conuerſion and change of the ſoule: when any man is conuerted, this worke of God is not done by compulſion, but he is conuerted willingly, and at the very time when he is conuerted by Gods grace, he willeth his conuerſion. To this end ſaith* S. Auguſtine, he which made thee without thee, will not ſaue thee without thee. Ser.15.de verb. Apoſt. *Againe, that it is certaine that our will is required in this, that we may do any thing well, (it is not onely then required in our firſt conuerſion, if it be required to all good things which we do,) but we haue it not from our owne power, but God workes to will in vs. For looke at what time God giues grace, at the ſame time he gines a will to deſire and will the ſame: as for example, when God workes faith, at the ſame time, he workes alſo vpon the will, cauſing it to deſire faith, and willingly to receiue the gift of beleeuing: God makes of the vnwilling wil a willing will, becauſe no man can receiue grace vtterly againſt his will, conſidering will conſtrained, is no will But here we muſt remember, that howſoeuer in reſpect of time, the working of grace by Gods ſpirit, and the willing of it in man go together: yet in regard of order, grace is firſt wrought, and mans will muſt firſt of all be acted and moued by grace; and then it alſo acteth, willeth, and moueth it ſelfe. And this is the laſt point of conſent betweene vs and the Romane Church, touching Free-will, neither may we proceed farther with them. Hitherto* M Perkins.

*Now before I come to the ſuppoſed difference, I gather firſt, that he yeeldeth vnto the principall point in controuerſie, that is, freedome of will, in ciuill and morrall workes in the ſtate of corruption, and all good workes in the ſtate of grace: for in his firſt concluſion diſtinguiſhing foure eſtates of man, he affirmeth, that in the third, of man renewed or (as we ſpeake) iuſtified, there is libertie of grace, that is, grace enableth mans will to do) if it pleaſe, ſuch ſpirituall workes, as God requireth at his hands. Yet leſt he be taken to yeeld in any thing, he doth in ſhew of words* Pag.16. *contra-*

*contradict both these points in another place: For in setting downe the difference of our opinions, he saith: that mans will in his conuersion is not actiue, but passiue, which is flat opposite vnto that which himselfe said a little before in his first conclusion; that in the conuersion of a sinner, mans will concurreth not passiuely, but is co-worker with Gods grace.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Bishop* vnderstandeth not the principall point in controuersie, and therefore thinketh that *M. Perkins* yeeldeth to the principal point in controuersie, when he doth nothing lesse. It was neuer any point of controuersie, whether man *in the state of corruption* haue *freedome of will in ciuill or morall workes*: for none of vs euer hath denyed it. Neither was it euer any point of controuersie, whether *man in the state of grace hath freedome of will to good workes*: for there is not one of vs but alwaies hath affirmed it, so that *M. Bishop* knoweth not indeede what he disputeth of. As for that *libertie of grace*, he expoundeth it also out of his owne blind fancie, and not out of our doctrine. For we do not meane thereby, that *grace enableth mans will to do, if it please, such spirituall works as God requireth at his hands*, but that grace worketh in the will of man *to please* to do such spirituall workes as God requireth at his hands. For hee doth not hang his worke vpon the suspended *if* of our will, but [a] *worketh in vs to will*, and [b] *causeth vs to do the things that he commaundeth vs to do*. But *M. Bishop* here imagineth, that *M. Perkins* contradicteth in one leafe that which he yeeldeth in another. He saith one where, *that mans will in his conuersion, is not actiue but passiue*. But let *M. Bishop* learne of *S. Austine*, that [c] *he that concealeth the words of the point in question is either an vnlearned Idiot, or a wrangling crauen, that studieth more to cauill, then either to teach or learne*. The words of *M. Perkins* are these: *The Papists say, Will hath a naturall cooperation; we deny it, and say, it hath cooperation onely by grace, being in it selfe not actiue but passiue, willing well onely as it is moued by grace, whereby it must first be acted and moued, before it can act or will*. Where he very plainely affirmeth the *cooperation of mans will in his conuersion*, but saith truely, that it *is of grace* it selfe, that it doth cooperate with grace. He saith, that *in it selfe it is not actiue but passiue*, but though in it *selfe* it be onely *passiue*, yet he acknowledgeth that

a Phil. 2. 13.
b Ezech. 36. 27. August. de Præd. sanct. cap. 10 Ipse facit vt illi faciant quæ præcepit. Et cap. 11. Promittit factum se vt faciat, quæ iubet vt fiant.
c August. quæst: vet. Test. 14. Qui verba suppremit quæstionis aut imperitus est aut tergiuersator, qui calumniæ magis studeat, quam doctrinæ.

that it becommeth *actiue* also, *by being acted or moued by grace.* Now how is this contrary to that which hee saith in the fifth conclusion, *that mans Free will concurres with Gods grace, as a fellow or co-worker in some sort, and is not passiue in all and euery respect?* *In some sort*, saith he, it is *a co-worker* with grace, and is not *passiue in all and euery respect.* How is that? *Mans will must first of all be acted and moued by grace, and then it also acteth, willeth, and moueth it selfe.* How can *M. Bishop* deuise to haue a man speake more agreeably to himselfe? But he plaieth the lewd cousener; and whereas the whole point of the controuersie lieth in these words, *by it selfe*, or *in it selfe*, he guilefully omitteth the same, and maketh *M. Perkins* absolutely to say, that *mans will in his conuersion is not actiue, but passiue*, when he saith, that *in it selfe* it is not actiue but passiue; declaring that by grace it is made *actiue.* So in the other place where it is said, that mans will is a co-worker *in some sort*, and is not passiue *in all and euery respect*, he leaueth out those termes of restraint, as if *M. Perkins* had made the will simply and of it *selfe a co-worker* with grace, and not *passiue* in any respect. The contradiction therefore was not in *M. Perkins* his words, but in *M. Bishops* head, or rather in his malitious and wicked heart, which blind-foldeth him to make him seeme not to see that which he seeth well enough.

## 5. W. Bishop.

*The like contradiction may be obserued in the other part of libertie in moral actions: for in his third conclusion he declineth plainely, man to haue a naturall freedome, euen since the fall of Adam, to doe, or not to doe the acts of wisdome, Iustice, Temperance, &c. and proues out of* S. Paul, *that the Gentiles so did: yet in his first reason, he affirmeth as peremptorily out of the eighth of* Genesis, *that the whole frame of mans heart is corrupted, & all that he thinketh, deuiseth, or imagineth, is wholy euill, leauing him no naturall strength to performe any part of morall duty. See how vncertaine the steps be of men that walke in darknes, or that would seeme to communicate with the works of darknesse. For if I mistake him not, he agreeth fully in this matter of* Free will, *with the Doctrine of the Catholike Church: for he putting down the point of difference, saith, that it standeth in the cause of the freedome of mans will in spirituall matters: allowing then freedome of will with vs in the state* Pag. 19.

of grace, whereof he there treateth: for he ſeemeth to diſſent from vs onely in the cauſe of that freedom. And as he diſſereth from Luther and Caluin, with other ſectaries, in granting this libertie of will: ſo in the very cauſe alſo he accordeth with Catholikes, as appeareth by his owne words. For (ſaith he) Papiſts ſay, mans will concurreth with Gods grace by it ſelfe, and by it owne naturall power: we ſay, that mans will worketh with grace; yet not of it ſelfe, but by grace: either he vnderſtandeth not what Catholikes ſay, or elſe accuſeth them wrongfully: for we ſay, that mans will then onely concurreth with Gods grace, when it is ſtirred and holpen firſt by Gods grace. So that mans will by his owne naturall action, doth concurre in euery good worke, otherwiſe it were no action of man: but we farther ſay, that this action proceedeth principally of grace, whereby the will was made able to produce ſuch actions: for of it ſelfe it was vtterly vnable to bring forth ſuch ſpirituall fruit. And this I take to bee that, which M. Perkins doth meane by thoſe his words: that the will muſt be firſt moued and acted by grace, before it can act or will. He miſtooke vs, thinking that wee required ſome outward helpe onely to the will, to ioyne with it; or rather, that grace did but as it were vntie the chaines of ſinne wherein our will was fettered: and then Will could of it ſelfe turne to God. Not vnderſtanding how Catholikes take that Parable of the man wounded in the way, between Ieruſalem and Ieriche, who Luc.10. was (not as the Papiſts onely ſay, but as the holy Ghoſt ſaith) left halfe, and not ſtarke dead. Now the expoſition of Catholikes is not, that this wounded man, (which ſignifieth all mankind) had halfe his ſpirituall ſtrength left him; but was robbed of all ſupernaturall riches, ſpoyled of his originall iuſtice, and wounded in his naturall powers of both Vnderſtanding and Will, and therein left halfe dead, not beeing able of his own ſtrength, either to know all naturall truth, or to performe all morall duty. Now touching ſupernaturall workes, becauſe he loſt all power to performe them, not beeing able ſo much as to prepare himſelfe conuenientlie to them: he in a good ſence may be likened vnto a dead man, not able to moue one finger that way of grace: and ſo in holy Scripture the father Luc.15. ſaid of his prodigall Son, He was dead and is reuiued. Yet as the ſame ſonne liued a naturall life, albeit in a deadly ſinne: ſo mans will after the fall of Adam, continued ſomewhat free in actions conformable to the nature of man, though wounded alſo in them, as not being able to act many of them, yet hauing ſtill that naturall faculty of Free will, capable of grace, and alſo able, beeing firſt both outwardly moued, and fortified inwardly

*wardly by the vertue of grace, to effect and doe any worke apertaining to saluation: which is as much as* M. Perkins *affirmeth. And this to bee the very doctrine of the Church of Rome, is most manifestly to be seene in the Councell of Trent, where in the Session are first these words in effect, concerning the vnableneſſe of man to arise from sinne of himselfe.* Euery man muſt acknowledge and confeſſe, that by *Adams* fall we were made ſo vncleane and ſinfull, that neither the Gentiles by the force of nature, nor the Iewes by the letter of *Moſes* law, could ariſe out of that ſinfull ſtate. After it ſheweth, how our deliuerance is wrought, and how freedome of will is recouered in ſpeciall, and wherein it conſiſteth, ſaying: The beginning of iuſtification, in perſons vſing reaſon, is taken from the grace of God, preuenting vs through *Ieſus Chriſt*, that is, from his vocation, whereby without any deſert of ours we are called, that wee who were by our ſinnes turned away from God, may be prepared by his grace, both raiſing vs vp, and helping vs to returne to our owne iuſtification, freely yeelding our conſent vnto the ſaid grace, and working with it. So as God touching the heart of man by the light of the holy Ghoſt, neither doth man nothing at all, receiuing that inſpiration, who might alſo refuſe it: neither yet can he without the grace of God, by his Free will, mooue himſelfe to that, which is iuſt in Gods ſight. *And that you may be aſſured, that this doctrine of the Councell, is no other then that which was taught three hundred yeares before, in the very middeſt of darkeneſſe, as Heretikes deeme: ſee what S.* Thomas *of* Aquine *one of her principal pillars, hath written of this point in his moſt learned Summe. Where vpon theſe wordes of our Sauiour,* No man can come to me vnleſſe my Father drawe him, *he concludeth it to be manifeſt, that man cannot ſo much as prepare himſelfe to receiue the light of grace, but by the free and vnderſerued help of God, moouing him inwardly thereunto. And this is all which* M. Perkins *in his pretended diſſent auerreth here, and goeth about to proue in his fiue reaſons following: the which I will omit, as beeing all for vs. And if any man deſire to ſee more to that purpoſe, let him read the moſt learned workes of that famous Cardinall, and right reuerend Archbiſhop* Bellarmine.

1.2.q.109. Art.6.

Ioh.6.

R. ABBOT.

Here is another contradiction framed vpon the anuile of *M. Bi-*

*ſhops* ignorance, whileſt he vnderſtandeth not, that works morally
a Luke 16.15. good, may be ſpiritually euill, and whileſt they a *are highly eſteemed with men* for the ſubſtance of the act, yet may *be abominable with God*, by the vncleanneſſe of the heart. Which if he had duly conſidered, he might well haue ſeene, that both theſe aſſertions may ſtand together, that *man hath freedome of will to doe the outward acts of morall vertues*, and yet that *all that man deuiſeth, frameth or imagineth is wholly euill*, becauſe his morall vertues without grace are in Gods ſight but ſo many corruptions of good works, being poiſoned in the roote of vnbeliefe, and wholly diuerted from their true and proper end; ſo that God hath not reſpect to them, becauſe in them there is no reſpect at all to God. This followeth afterwards more fully to be handled towards the end of this queſtion: but in the meane time we ſee how ſimply he collecteth of this latter point, that *M. Perkins leaueth a man no naturall ſtrength to performe any part of morall duty*, and as if he had very wiſely handled the matter, addeth his *epiphonema: So vncertaine are the ſteps of them that walke in darkneſſe*; very fitly agreeing to himſelfe, who neither vnderſtandeth what the aduerſary ſaith, nor what he himſelfe is to ſay for his owne part. Whereupon it is that he conceiueth that *M. Perkins fully agreeth with the Romiſh Church in this matter of Free will*, whereas they are as farre different one from the other, as heauen is from earth. The agreement forſooth is, in that *M. Perkins* granteth *Free will in the ſtate of grace*. But ſo did *Luther* and *Caluin*, and ſo doe we all, as farre as *M. Perkins* doth. The Papiſts ſay, that man hath in his owne nature a power of *Free will*, which being onely ſtirred and helped, can, and doth *of it ſelfe* adioine it ſelfe to grace to accept thereof, and to worke with it. This is it that we denie: we ſay, that *freedome of the will* to turne to God, and to worke with him, is no power of nature, but the worke of grace; that it is in no ſort of man himſelfe, but wholly and onely the gift of God: that howſoeuer God doe offer grace, yet that man hath no power in himſelfe, or in his owne will to aſſent and yeeld vnto it, but it is God himſelfe that withall worketh in him to accept thereof, that to the conuerſion of a ſinner, there ariſeth nothing from the motion of his owne will, howſoeuer aſſiſted and helped of God, but what God by his Spirit doth worke in it.

Vpon this point onely *Luther* and *Caluin*, and wee all inſiſt to cha-

challenge all wholy vnto God. In this respect was it that *Luther* said, that *Free will is, Res de solo titulo, a matter of name onely, and a bare title*, because of man himselfe it is nothing, and by it, or in it there can nothing be attributed vnto him. For [a] *we will indeede*, it is true, *but God worketh in vs to will; we work, but it is God that worketh in vs to work; wee walke, but he causeth vs to walke; wee keepe his commandements, but he worketh in vs to keepe his commandements*, so that nothing is ours of our selues, but all is his onely. And this *M. Bishop* in some shew of words heere seemeth to affirme, but indeed he wholy ouerthroweth it. He saith, that *mans will then onely concurreth with Gods grace, when it is first stirred and holpen by grace*, and therefore that *M. Perkins either doth not vnderstand them, or else doth wrongfully accuse them*, in that hee chargeth them to say, that *mans will concurreth with Gods grace by it selfe, and by it owne naturall power*. But *M. Perkins* vnderstood them well enough, and doth no whit wrongfully accuse them. For *Andradius* the expounder of the riddles of the Councell of Trent, doth plainely tell vs, [b] *that the motion of Free will, and applying of it selfe to righteousnesse, doth no more depend vpon the grace of God then the fires burning of the woode doth depend vpon the power of God; that grace lifteth it vp beeing fallen downe, and addeth strength vnto it, but that it is no lesse the efficient cause of applying it selfe to grace, then other naturall things are of all those operations whereto by force of nature they are caried.* Therefore hee compareth [c] *Free will to a man made fast in the stockes, who hath a power and ableneſse in himselfe to go, if hee bee let goe out of the stockes, and the bonds be broken that held him before that hee could not stirre.* Whereby he giueth vs to vnderstand their mind, that as the fire and other naturall things beeing by the power of God vpholden in that which naturally they are, do of themselues worke their proper and naturall effects, and as a man vnbound and let goe out of the stockes walketh and goeth, not by any new worke that is wrought in him, but by his owne former naturall power; so *Free will* though entangled in the delights of sinne, and bound with the bonds thereof, yet hath a naturall power whereby it can apply it selfe to righteousnesse, if grace by breaking the bonds, and abating the strength of sinne, doe but make way for it to vse and exercise it selfe; so that grace hauing wrought what concerneth it, they leaue it to the will *by it selfe, and by it owne naturall power*, to adioyne it

[a] *August. de bono perseu. cap. 13. & cont. 2. ep. Pelag. lib. 4. cap. 6.*

[b] *Andrad. orthodoxar. explicat. li. 4. Liberi nostri arbitrij motio atque ad iustitiam applicatio non magis à gratia Dei pendet, quam à diuina virtute stipitis exustio, &c. Cum diuina gratia iacentem libertatem erigat & confirmet vtrosque illi addat, ex quibus oblata iustitiæ ornamenta complecti possit, non secus quidem sui ad iustitiam applicationis causa efficiens dicenda est, ac ea quæ natura constant, earum omnium operationum ad quas natura impulsione feruntur.*

[c] *Ibid. Non secus ac ligneis solet detrunctis, qui incredibili quidem facultatem habet, et si ingressu nullo modo possit ni vincula rumpantur prius quæ motum reprimunt et retardant.*

it selfe to worke therwith. And this *Bellarmine* plainely testifieth, when he affirmeth, [d] that grace doth no otherwise concurre to supernaturall actions, then vniuersall causes doe to naturall, so that it doth no more in the worke of righteousnesse, then the Sunne and heauenly powers doe in the act of generation, or the producing of other naturall effects yeelding an influence and inclination, but leauing the verie act to the will and worke of man. All which in effect *M. Bishop* himselfe afterwards expresseth, teaching that man *after the fall of Adam, hath still a naturall faculti̇e of Free will, which beeing first outwardly moued, and inwardly fortified by the vertue of grace, is able to effect and do any worke appertaining to saluation*; thereby giuing to vnderstand, that there is still an abilitie left in nature, howsoeuer for the present ouerwhelmed and oppressed, which beeing excited and stirred vp, though in it selfe it bee not sufficient to produce the effects of spirituall actions, yet hath a sufficiencie to applie it selfe to grace for the producing thereof. Which *Costerus* the Iesuite declareth, by the similitude of [e] *a man fallen into a darke and deepe pit, whence he cannot get out by himselfe, nor hath care to get out, but sleepeth securely therein, till his friend come, who awaketh him out of his sleepe, and wisheth him to get out, and by reasons perswadeth him to be willing thereto, and so giueth him his hand, or reacheth to him a cord, which he taketh and laieth fast hold on it, and yeeldeth his owne vttermost strength that he may be pulled out.* To which purpose also he vseth another example, of a man [f] *extremely faint and weake, lying with his face turned away from the fire or the Sunne, who is not able to turne himselfe to the fire or the Sunne, but if he haue one to helpe him, vseth his owne strength also for the turning of himselfe about to enioy the warmth thereof.* Which comparisons doe plainelie shew, that they attribute vnto *Free will* a proper and seuerall worke beside that that is done by the grace of God. Whereby wee see how guilefully *M. Bishop* speaketh, when he saith, *that the wil is made able by grace to bring forth spiritual fruit, being of it self viterly vnable thereto*, because he meaneth not herby, that grace doth worke in the will that whole ability that it hath, but that to the ability which the will naturally hath, grace offereth, and being accepted, yeeldeth only an assistance and help for the accomplishment of the worke. Which he implieth in that he saith, that the worke *proceedeth principally of*

grace:

[d] *Bellarm de grat. & lib. arb. lib 6. ca. 15 Sicut auxilium generale ita concurrit cum omnibus rebus in actionibus naturalibus, vt tamen non impediat libertatem & contingentiam, sta speciale auxilium eduuans sta concurrit ad omnes actiones supernaturales vt no impediat hominis libertatem: quoniã tode prorsus modo auxilia ista concurrunt.*

[e] *Coster. Enchirid. cap. 5. Sit qui spiam lapsus in foueam tenebrosã ex qua nequeat egredi nec exire solus possit, sed in ea securus obdormiat: accedat ad eum amicus qui hominis miseritus de somno excitatũ ad egressum moneat multisque rationibus vt assentiatur inducat: tũ si manum vel finem porrigat & simul conantem educat: in lumen.*

[f] *Ibid. Homo languidus qui ab igne vel a lumine aliis facie auersus ipse solus non potest conuertere: nisi accedat amicus qui iuuet & languidus ipse conatum ad quem adhibeat fit iandem vt conuersus calore solis aut ignis fruatur.*

*grace*: not wholy but *principally*; onely becauſe grace firſt occaſioneth and beginneth the ſame, whereas otherwiſe they make *Free will* parallel-wiſe, and as it were ſide by ſide concurre with grace to the effecting of that whereto it tendeth. Yet hee will not haue vs thinke, *that they require ſome outward helpe onely to the will, to ioyne with grace, or that grace doth but as it were vnlie the chaines of ſinne, wherein our will is fettered, and then will eanne of it ſelfe turne to God*, when indeede hee cannot well tell what hee would haue vs thinke. Wee heare him and his fellowes talke of *inward mouing*, & *inward fortifying*, but in truth they make all this *inward* but onely *outward*, becauſe they ſtill denie, that grace worketh that intrinſecall act of the will, whereby it firſt applieth it ſelfe to God, and doe leaue [g] the will of man to make vp the worke of grace, by that that meerely and naturaly is his owne. In reſpect whereof *Coſterus* compareth grace [h] *to a ſtaffe in a mans hand, which at his owne will hee either vſeth for his helpe, or throweth away*, ſtill excluding that worke of God, whereby it is wrought in the will, to will and receiue the grace of God, and not to reiect the ſame. The neceſſity of which worke herein plainely appeareth, for that man as touching ſpirituall life [i] *the life of God* is wholy dead, and therefore as the dead man hath no facultie or power left, whereby to doe any thing for himſelfe for recouery of life againe, but his life and the life of all his parts muſt wholy and newly bee put into him, ſo man hath nothing left in nature, whereof with any helpe whatſoeuer he canne make any vſe to returne to God againe, but this life muſt wholie and newly bee wrought in him by the grace and power of God. Now in this point *M. Biſhop* ſtutteth and ſtammereth, and knoweth not how or what to ſay. Man, he ſaith, is *but halfe dead, not ſtarke dead*, and by and by after *hee is halfe dead in his naturall powers of vnderſtanding and will, but touching ſupernaturall workes, hee may in a good ſenſe bee likened to a dead man*; and yet preſently ſaith againe, that *in this ſtate there is a naturall facultie of Free will, which is able beeing outwardlie mooued and inwardly fortified, to effect and doe any worke appertaining to ſaluation.* Whereby he wholy ouerthroweth the compariſon of *a dead man*, becauſe where there is remaining an actiue power that needeth onely to bee ſtirred vp and ſtrengthened, there cannot be affirmed the ſtate of death. But the Scripture pronounceth man abſolutely *dead: The* [k] *dead ſhall heare*

[g] *Andrad. vt ſupra. Homini ſemper liberum relinquitur diuine operationi prebere impedimentum, eamque velamplecti vel repudiare.*

[h] *Coſter. vt ſupra. Eſt hec gratia in arbitrio vehementu vt ea vti poſſit, & non vti, retinere & abijcere; quemadmodum baculus in manu conualeſcentis, cuius auxilio ſi velit vtetur, ſin minus poterit eum remouere.*

[i] Epheſ. 4. 18.

[k] Iohn. 5. 25.

*the voyce of the Sonne of God, and they that heare it, shall liue:* [l] *You were dead in trespasses and sinnes;* not [m] *halfe dead*, like the man that *descended from Ierusalem to Iericho* (to whom S. *Ambrose* more fitly resembleth man falling after Baptisme, and in the state of grace) but plainely [o] *dead, like Lazarus, foure dayes dead, and now stinking* in his graue, in *whose raising vp was* [q] *the power of Christ, not any strength of the dead man*; so as that the recouering of a man to faith and spirituall life, is by [r] *the same working of the mightie power of God, which he wrought in Christ when hee raised him from the dead.* Which if *M. Bishop* did acknowledge, according to the plaine euidence of holy Scripture, hee would not thus halt betwixt grace and Free will, but would confesse, that whatsoeuer the will doth in the worke of saluation, the same is fully and wholly wrought therein by grace. But now he doth but dally with the name of *Grace*, as *Pelagius* the heretike did, onely to hide the venime and poyson of his false doctrine, [t] *to abate the hatred, and auoyd the offence* that should otherwise arise against him. And no otherwise doth the Councell of Trent which he alleadgeth for his warrant, the doctrine whereof is the very same with the Pelagian heresie, beeing taken with those corrections and limitations wherewith *Pelagius* and his followers did abridge and explaine themselues. For they denied not a necessitie of the grace of God, *Pelagius* himselfe plainely saying, [u] *Wee say that wee haue a Free will which in all good workes is alwaies assisted with the helpe of God;* [x] *Wee so confesse Free will, as that we say that we alwaies stand in need of the helpe of God:* [y] *Wee can do no good at all without God:* [z] *We so praise nature, as that we alwaies adde the helpe of the grace of God.* And that we may see that he first trod the path for the Councell of Trent to follow, hee sticketh not to pronounce [a] *Anathema to euery one that thinketh or saith, that the grace of God whereby Christ came into this world to saue sinners is not necessarie, not onely euery houre and euery moment, but to euery act of ours, and they that goe about to denie it shall be punished for euer.* So doth the Pelagian heretike affirme to *Hierome*; [b] *There be very many of ours who say, that all things that we doe, are done by the helpe of God.* By this acknowledgement of grace *Pelagius* deluded the Bishops of the Easterne Churches, before whom he was conuented, and by

l Ephes. 2. 1. 5. Col. 2. 13.
m Luc. 10. 30.
n *Ambros. de paenit. lib. 1. cap.* 10.
o Mat. 8. 22.
p John 11. 39.
q *Aug. in Ioan. tract. 49. Surrexit, processit. In vtroque potentia Domini erat, non vires mortui.*
r Ephes. 1. 19.
s *August. cont. Pelag. & Celest. lib. 1. cap. 37. Gratia vocabulo frangens inuidiam offensionemq; declinans.*
t Pelag. apud *Aug. ibid. lib. 1. cap. 31. Liberum arbitrium habere nos dicimus quod in omnibus bonis operibus diuino semper adiuuatur auxilio.*
u Cap. 33. *Liberum sic confitemur arbitrium vt dicamus nos indigere Dei semper auxilio.*
x Cap. 33. *Epistola nostra confitetur nos omnino nihil boni facere posse sine Deo.*
y Cap. 37. *Inuenient nos ita hominis laudare naturam vt Dei semper gratia addamus auxilium.*
z Cap. 2. *Anathema qui sentit vel docet gratiam Dei qua Christus venit in hunc mundum peccatores saluos facere, non solum per singulas horas, aut per singula momenta, sed etiam per singulos actus nostros non esse necessariam, & qui hanc contendit auferre poenas sortiuntur aeternas.*
a Hieron. adu. Pelag. l. 3. *Sunt plerique nostrorum qui omnia quae agimus dicant fieri praesidio Dei.*

by that meanes was acquitted and dismissed, as hauing taught nothing against the truth. For as *Austin* noteth, [b] *When they heard him confesse the grace of God, they could imagine no other grace, but what they were wont to read in the booke of God, and preach to the people of God.* Which *grace* by this occasion the same S. *Austin* in diuers and sundry places defineth to bee that [c] *whereby wee are Christians and the children of God; and being predestinate are called, iustified, and glorified:* [d] *whereby we are iustified to be iust men:* [e] *which maketh the doctrine of God profitable vnto vs:* [f] *whereby hee doth not onely shew vs the truth, but also inspireth loue:* [g] *whereby we are iustified, that is, whereby the loue of God is shedde abroad in our hearts by the holy Ghost which is giuen vnto vs;* [h] *whereby we are made good;* [i] *whereby the excellencie of heauenly glorie, is not onely promised, but also beleeued and hoped for; nor wisedome onely reuealed, but loued, and euery thing that is good is not onely aduised, but (fruitfully and effectually) perswaded.* This onely grace and no other did they vnderstand to be the *grace of Christ*, whereby as touching the worke of our saluation, God is all in all, whilest of him and by him, meerely by his gift we are whatsoeuer we are towards him, so that although [k] wee will, and we worke, and wee walke, and wee runne, yet it is God that worketh in vs, to will, and to worke, and to walke, and to runne, and in all these things wee haue nothing but what wee haue of him, that there may bee no exception to the Apostles question, [l] *What hast thou that thou hast not receiued? and if thou haue receiued it, why doest thou boast as if thou hadst not receiued it?* But this *grace* *Pelagius* could by no meanes endure: he thought it absurd, that all should be ascribed to God, and therefore would needes deuise a course of grace that might giue way to the *Free will* of man. The contriuing of which course, if we duly consider from point to point, wee shall see, that it most fully correspondeth and accordeth to that doctrine of grace and Free will, which is now taught in the Church of Rome; onely the specialties thereof their schoole diuines haue directed them to expresse somewhat more distinctly then he hath done. And first they tell vs of *grace preuenting, existing and stirring vp, whereby* saith the Councell, *without any desert of*

b *August. epist. 95. Hu audita verba (hominem Dei gratia adiuuari, &c.) Catholici omnibus aliam nullam aliam Dei gratiam intelligere potuerunt, nisi quam in libris Dei legare & populis Dei predicare consueuerunt.*

c *Ibid. Gratia qua Christiani & fij Dei sumus. Et posteà: Quia predestinatos vocamus, iustificatos glorificamus.*

d *Epist. 107. Quia iustificati summe vt homines iusti essemus.*

e *Epist. 107. Agnoscamus gratiam quæ facit prodesse doctrinam.*

f *Conc. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 13. Vt non esse dubiæ tantummodo veritatem, verumetiam imperitiæ charitatem.*

g *Ibid. cap. 20. Quia iustificatur, id est, qua charitas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris, &c.*

h *Cap. 2. Epist. Pelag. lib. 4. cap. 6. Hæc est gratia Dei bonos faciens nos.*

i *Conc. Pelag. & supra.*

cap. 10. *Iam aliquando fatetur qua futuræ gloriæ magnitudo non solum promittatur, verumetiam erogetur & seperatur; nec reuelatur solum sapientia, verumetiam & amatur, nec suadetur solum bonum quod bonum est, verumetiam persuadetur.* k *De grat. & lib. arbit. cap. 1. Certum est nos velle cum volumus, sed ille facit vt velimus, &c. Certum est nos facere cùm facimus, sed ille facit vt faciamus, &c.* l *1. Cor. 4. 7.*

ONE

ours we are called, that by his grace raising vs vp, and helping vs, we may be prepared to returne to our iustification. Where we are to note M. Bishops errour in his owne principles, who sundry times calleth the grace of first iustification* the first grace, forgetting that there is a former grace, to which he himselfe referreth their works of preparation, and here bringeth the councell describing it as precedent to iustification. But of this *preuenting grace* Costerus the Iesuite saith, that [m] *it is not that that dwelleth in the soule to make a man iust, but it is onely the impulsion and motion of the holy Ghost, beeing yet without, and standing knocking at the doore of the heart, not being as yet let in.* This he expresseth by the comparison of *a friend finding a man in a deepe pit*, as before was said, *and perswading him* [b] *diuers reasons to be willing to be pulled out.* Therefore *Bellarmine* saith, that [n] *it is but onely a perswading which doth not determine the will, but inclineth it in manner of a propounding obiect.* This grace *Pelagius* describeth in this sort: [o] *He worketh in vs to will that that is good, to will that that is holy, whilest finding vs giuen to earthly lusts, and like brute beasts louing onely present things* (note that hee excludeth all former merits as the councell doth) *he enkindleth our minds with the greatnesse of the glory to come, and with promise of reward: whilest by reuealing his wisdome, he raiseth vp our astonished will to the desire and longing after God; whilest he perswadeth and exhorteth vs to all good things.* And againe to the same purpose he saith: [p] *God helpeth vs by his doctrine and reuelation, whilest he openeth the eyes of our hearts, whilest hee sheweth vs things to come, that we may not be holden with things present; whilest he taieth open vnto vs the snares of the diuell; whilest he enlightneth vs with the manifold and vnspeakable gift of his heauenly grace.* Thus hitherto they agree as touching this *preuenting grace*, both calling that by the name of *grace*, which the auncient Church disclaimed vnder that name, because they vnderstood *grace* to bee meant of that onely, whereby God himselfe maketh vs to bee that that hee calleth vs to bee, and here is nothing but propounding, perswading, exhorting, stirring, enkindling, enlightening, mouing, knocking, but leauing it to vs, either to ac-

cept

* Of Iustification. sect. 32. Of Merits. sect. 1, &c.

m *Coster. de lib. arbit. Hæc gratia præueniens non est illa quæ in anima hominis habitans ipsum constituit & filium Dei efficit, sed impulsus tantum & motus Spiritus sancti adhuc foris degentis qui stat ad ostium cordis pulsans, nondum admissus ad eius domicilium.*

n *Bellarm. de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 6. cap. 15. Nihil est aliud nisi suasio quæ non determinat voluntatem sed inclinat per modum propositi obiecti.*

o *Pelag. apud August. cont. Pelag. & Celest. lib. 1. cap. 10. Operatur in nobis velle quod bonum est, velle quod sanctum est dum nos terrenis cupiditatibus deditos, mutorum more animalium tantummodo præsentia diligentes futura gloriæ magnitudine & præmiorum pollicitatione succendit, dum reuelatione sapientiæ in desiderium dei stupentem suscitat voluntatem: dum nobis suadet omne quod bonum est.*

p *Ibid. cap. 7. Adiuuat nos Deus per doctrinam & reuelationem suam dum cordis nostri oculos aperit, dum nobis ne præsentibus occupemur futura demonstrat, dum diaboli pandit insidias, dum nos multiformi & ineffabili dono gratiæ cælestis illuminat.*

cept or reiect that that is propounded and perſwaded, and * both reſting the acte and effect of all vpon man himſelfe, yeelding to his motion when it is at his owne diſcretion to doe otherwiſe. For *M. Biſhop* here telleth vs out of their learning, that there is in vs *a naturall facultie of Free will*, to which this propounding & perſwading is vſed, [q] *to which it is left to giue to theſe motions either admiſſion or repulſe.* [r] *It is left in the power of the will*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, *either to conſent to God calling and perſwading, or not to conſent vnto him.* Now ſaith *Coſterus*, [s] *He that by Free will admitteth of this grace, by the helpe of it* (not being yet any ſpirituall renewing grace, but onely *as the friend* (as before was ſaid) *reaching his hand, or giuing a coard to the man in the pit*) *he prepareth himſelfe by beleeuing, hoping, repenting, and performing workes of pietie, to receiue the grace of iuſtification.* So that before iuſtification, and without any inward or inhabitant grace of regeneration, euen by *Free will* receiuing onely a helpe which is without it, a man hath faith, hope, repentance, loue, by which, and for which (as *M. Biſhop* afterwards diſputeth) God is induced and moued to beſtow vpon vs his iuſtifying grace. All this matter *M. Biſhop* in the thirteenth Section of this queſtion ſetteth downe thus: *God by his grace knockes at the doore of our hearts: he doth not breake it open, or in any ſort force it, but attendeth, that by our aſſenting to his call, we open him the gates, and then loe he with his heauenly gifts will enter in.* Where by it appeareth, that with them the firſt inſenſecal act of mans conuerſion is of himſelfe, and an act of his owne *Free will*, occaſioned by God, but acted by man himſelfe, becauſe the act of grace on Gods part being compleat, there remaineth a diſtinct and ſeuerall act of the will of man for admitting of that grace of God, vpon admitting whereof followeth the endowment of the gifts of God, by which thenceforth *Free will* worketh according to the will of God. All this *Pelagius* alſo taught as they do, affirming *a power of nature* conſiſting in *Free will*, [t] *which power* (being not ſufficient of it ſelfe) *God alwaies aſſiſteth with the helpe of the foreſaid grace.* [u] *By his law, by his Scriptures, which we read or heare, he worketh that we may be willing; but to conſent or not conſent, is ſo ours, as that if we will, we do ſo; if not, we cauſe that the worke of God auaileth nothing.* Now then [x] *he that vſeth*

* *Ibid. cap. 4. Noſtrum eſt, quia hæc omnia vertere etiam in malum poſſumus: Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 6. cap. 5. Neque homo ipſe nihil omnino agit, ſui ſpirationem illam recipiens, quippe qui illam & abijcere poteſt.*

q *Coſter. vt ſupr. Relicta voluntatis libertate, qua fieri poteſt, vt vel ſuſcipiantur influxus diuini vel repulſam patiantur.*

r *Bellar. de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 5. cap. 29. Impoteſtate voluntatis relinquitur vt conſentiat vocanti & ſuadenti vel non conſentiat.*

s *Coſter. ib. Qui hanc gratiam admittit, eadem ad iuſtificationem progreditur vlterius, vt credendo, ſperando, pœnitendo, ad iuſtificationis gratiam ſe paret.* Of Iuſtification. Sect. 21.

t *Pelag. apud Auguſt. contra Pelag. & Cœleſt. lib. 1. cap. 4. Ipſam poſſibilitatem gratiæ ſuæ adiuuat ſemper auxilio.*

u *Auguſt. Epiſt. 107 Per legem, per Scripturas ſuas Deus operatur vt velimus, ſed eis conſentire, vel non conſentire, ita noſtrum eſt*

*vt ſi velimus fiat: ſi autem nolimus, nihil in nobis operationem Dei valere faciamus.* x *Contr. Pelag. vt ſupra cap. 32. 33. Qui currit ad Deum, & ab eo ſe regi cupit, id eſt, voluntatem ſuam ex eius voluntate ſuſpendit, qui ei adhærendo iugiter vnus cum illo ſit ſpiritus, non hoc niſi de arbitrij efficit libertate. Qua qui bene vtitur, ita ſe totum tradit Deo omnemq; ſuam mortificat voluntatem, vt cum Apoſtolo poſſit dicere, Viuo autem, &c. ponitque cor ſuum in manus Dei*

*vt ſi velimus*

bis

*his Free will aright*, ſaith hee, *he runneth vnto God, and deſireth to be guided and directed by him, and hangeth his will vpon the will of God, to whom being ioyned by cleaning ſtil vnto him, he becommeth or is made one ſpirit with him: he ſo committeth himſelfe wholly to God, and mortifieth all his owne will, that with the Apoſtle he may be able to ſay, Now I liue, yet not I, but Chriſt liueth in me: he putteth his heart into Gods hand, that God may incline it whither it ſhall pleaſe him.* Here is Free will yeelding aſſent to God, and from thence (by aſſiſtance of grace which he alſo, as we haue heard, acknowledgeth in his meaning, which is the ſame with the Papiſts, to be neceſſarie alwaies, and in all things,) there follow *the workes of preparation*, which hee expreſſeth by tearmes of *running vnto God, deſiring to be guided by him, mortifying our owne will, putting our heart into Gods hand, hanging our will vpon Gods will.* Now hereupon will hee haue to enſue the iuſtifying grace and gift of God, which hee ſignifieth by *becomming one ſpirit with God, by hauing Chriſt to liue in vs, by hauing God to incline our hearts whither it pleaſeth him.* [y] *A great helpe of grace indeed*, ſaith *Auſtin*, *that God incline our hearts whither he will; but this ſo great helpe as he (Pelagius) doteth, we then merit (or obtaine) when without any helpe, onely by Free will, we runne to God, deſire to be guided by him, &c. That theſe merits going before, we may ſo obtain grace, that God may incline our heart whither hee will.* And this is alſo the very ſelfe ſame dotage, that now poſſeſſeth the Church of Rome. For if *M. Biſhop* will except, that they doe not affirme their *workes of preparations* to be *without any helpe of grace, onely of Free will*: I anſwer him, that no more did *Pelagius*, who accurſed them (as hath beene ſaid) who held not the grace of God to be neceſſarie to euery acte. But yet in that meaning, wherein *S. Auſtine* ſpeaketh of [z] *the helpe of God*, as whereby the thing it ſelfe is wrought in vs, wherein wee are ſaid to bee helped, they ſay, as *S. Auſtin* chargeth *Pelagius* to haue ſaid, that their *preparations* are *without any helpe of grace, and onely of Free will*, becauſe there is for the time of this preparation no inhabitant or renuing grace, no habitual quality or gift of grace that ſhould be the worker thereof. They onely teach, as *Pelagius* did, a grace though internall in reſpect of the man, yet to the will onely externally aſſiſtant, mooning and directing it for the doing of theſe things, but meerely the will it ſelfe is the doer of them. Which hereby alſo is apparant, for that if they were properly the effects of grace

y *Auguſt. ibid. Magnum profectò diuinæ gratiæ adiutorium, vt cor noſtrum, quò voluerit Deus, ipſe declinet: ſed hoc tam magnum adiutorium, ſicut ipſe deſpit, ſunc meremur, cùm ſine vllo adiutorio niſi de arbitrij libertate ad Dominum currimus, & erga his præcedentibus meritis ſic eius conſequamur gratiam, vt cor noſtrum quo voluerit, ipſe declinet.*

z See after in Sect. 15.

they ſhould by their doctrine bee *meritorious ex condigno*, whereas now they are denied ſo to be, and thereby are denied to be the proper effects of grace. And hence *M. Biſhop* thinketh to haue another difference betwixt the Pelagians and them, becauſe *Pelagius* affirmed *merits* before the grace of iuſtification, and they doe not ſo. But this will not ſerue his turne, becauſe *Bellarmine* confeſſeth, as the truth is, that the Fathers in condemning *Pelagius* for affirming *grace to be giuen in reſpect of merits*, did vnderſtand *merit* [a] *when any thing is done by our owne power, in reſpect whereof grace is giuen, though the ſame be not merit ex condigno.* Such are their *works of preparation*, which are done by *our owne power* in that meaning as the Fathers ſpake, as hath beene ſaid, becauſe they are no proper effects of renewing grace, and are defended by them to bee the cauſe for which God beſtoweth his grace vpon vs. They defend therefore that which was condemned in the Pelagians, that *the grace of God is giuen according to our merits*, [b] *that we firſt giue ſomewhat by Free will, for which grace is to be rendred for reward.* They ſay as the Pelagians did, [c] *We worke to merit, that God may worke with vs.* Yea they profeſſedly teach, that their *preparations* are *merits*, though not *ex condigno*, yet *ex congruo*, becauſe by the rule of their ſchooles, [d] *it is meete, or ſtanding with reaſon, that whileſt a man well vſeth his owne power, God according to his more excellent power doe worke more excellently.* They thinke themſelues well diſcharged, for that they put no merits before the firſt grace, as they call it, whereas therein they ſay no more then *Pelagius* did. He made *the firſt grace* [e] *a thing common both to the wicked and to the godly, to Pagans and Chriſtians, to beleeuers and infidels*, conſiſting in motions and illuminations, offered to all, and left to euery mans *Free will*, to accept or reiect them, euen [f] ſo doe they. They ſay, that before that *firſt grace* there are no merits at all precedent: euen ſo ſaid he, affirming the calling of God, *whileſt he findeth vs giuen to earthly luſts, and like bruit beaſts louing onely preſent things*, as his owne words haue told vs. But *the firſt grace or preuenting grace*, before which the Fathers ſay there are *no merits in iuſtifying grace*, [g] *the grace whereby he maketh vs to walke, to obſerue, to doe* what he commandeth, whereby hee himſelfe worketh the effect of that, which either by outward inſtruction, or inward motion and illumination he doth commend vnto vs. Before this grace they place their merits or works of preparation, thereby to obtaine

[a] *Bellar. de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 6. cap. 5. Gratuam Dei ſecundum merita noſtra dari intelligunt Patres cùm aliquid ſit proprijs viribus ratione cuius datur gratia, etiamſi non ſit illud meritum de condigno.*

[b] *Auguſt. contr. 2. Epiſt. Pelag. lib. 4. cap. 6. Priores vtique dare quod libet ex libero arbitrio vt ſit gratia retribuenda pro premio.*

[c] *Ibid. Nos facimus vt mereamur cum quibus faciat Deus.*

[d] *Thom. Aquin. 1. 2. q. 114. art. 6. in Corp. Congruum eſt vt dum homo bene vtitur virtute ſua, Deus ſecundum ſuperexcellentem virtutem excellentius operetur.*

[e] *Aug. Epiſt. 106. Hæc intelligitur doctore ipſo gratia Dei, qua Pagani atque Chriſtiani, impijs & pijs, fidelibus atque infidelibus communis eſt.*

[f] *Bellar. de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 2. cap. 3. Lumine gratiæ nemo omnino priuatur.*

[g] *Aug. contr. 2. Epiſt. Pelag. lib. 4. cap. 6. Ille facit vt ambulemus, vt obſeruemus, vt faciamus. Hæc eſt gratia bonus faciens, non hæc miſericordia præueniens nos.*

obtaine it, contrarie to the words of the Apoſtle, as *S. Auſtin* witneſſeth: [h] *Not of workes, leſt any man ſhould boaſt:* and againe, *If it be of grace, it is not of workes.* And heerin their iniquitie is the greater, in that they borrow the termes of a diſtinction of [i] *grace preuenient and ſubſequent* from *S. Auſtin*, and apply it otherwiſe then he meant it, to the maintenance of an hereſie, which he oppugned by it. Thus *M. Biſhop* for his life cannot imagine a better accord, then there is betwixt *Pelagius* the Hereticke and their Councell of Trent, both auouching, and by fraudulent deuices maintaining the power of nature and Free will againſt the truth of the grace of God. And to aſſure vs that they attribute thereto as much as *Pelagius* did, [k] *who ſo defended the power of nature, as that a man without the name of Chriſt might be ſaued by Free will*, *Andradius* telleth vs, out of the ſecrets of that Councell, that they alſo hold, [l] *that heathen Philoſophers, hauing no knowledg of the law or of the Goſpell of Chriſt, were iuſtified and ſaued onely by the law of nature; that they religiouſly worſhipped one God, put all their truſt in him, hoped for reward of their vertues from him*, yet all this *by the grace of God* he ſaith, which *Pelagius* alſo would ſay, but both teaching no other grace but what the heathens themſelues confeſſed, that [m] *neuer any man prooued great and excellent without ſome diuine inſtinct*: ſo that *Ariſtotle*, & *Tully*, and ſuch other acknowleging the ſame, muſt now bee taken for Preachers of *the grace of God*. Wherein we may wonder at their impudencie, that doubt not to affirme a thing ſo plainely abſurd, and ſo reſolued againſt by *S. Auſtin* in his defences againſt the Pelagians, concluding by imitation of the Apoſtles words, that [n] *if by the law of nature there be righteouſneſſe without the faith of the paſſion and reſurrection of Chriſt, then Chriſt died in vaine.* And againe, that [o] *to affirme, that a man may be iuſtified by the law of nature and Free will, is to make the croſſe of Chriſt of no effect.* But by all this wee ſee, that their ſpeech of *grace* for conuerting of man to God, is but colluſion and meere Pelagian hypocriſie, as whereby indeed they attribute no greater a worke to God in bringing man to righteouſneſſe, then to the diuell in bringing man to ſin. Which beeing condemned in the [p] Pelagians as a horrible impietie and blaſphemie, yet by *Coſterus* the Ieſuite in his Enchiridion, is manifeſtly acknowledged to

[h] *Contr. Pelag. & Celeſt. lib. 1. ca. 23.*
[i] *Enchir. cap. 32.*
[k] *Auguſt. de na. & grat. cap. 39. Poſſibilitatem humanæ naturæ ita defendit, vt homo per Liberum arbitrium etiam ſine Chriſti nomine ſaluus eſſe poſſe credatur.*
[l] *Andrad. Ortho. explica. li. 3. Sine lege Moſis & Euangelica nobis per Chriſtum data ſola lege naturæ permulti ſuiſſe Dei gratia iuſtificatos & ſaluatos: & prius vnicum Deum religioſè veneratiſſe: in ipſo ſpes ſuas omnes collocaruntillis perpetuo placere ſtuduerunt, ab illo virtutum remunerationem ſperarunt.*
[m] *Ariſt. de mundo. Cic. de Nat. Deor. Nemo vir magnus ſine aliquo afflatu diuino vnquam fuit. Nemo nisi iuuante Deo, talis fuiſſe credendum eſt.*
[n] *Aug. de nat. & grat. cap. 2. Si per naturam iuſtitia (nulla fide paſſionis Chriſti & reſurrectionis imbuitam) ergo Chriſtus gratis mortuus eſt.*
[o] *Ibid cap. 9. Ecce quod eſt crucem Chriſti euacuare, ſine illa quenquam per naturalem legem & voluntatis arbitrium iuſtificari poſſe contendere.*
[p] *Proſp. de lib. arbit. Oſtendere voluit inter boni & mali contrarias ſuaſiones, ita animum hominem propriæ diſcretioni eſſe commiſſum vt ei non plus à Deo præſidij quàm à Diabolo ſit periculi.*

be

be their meaning, [q] *that as the diuell by temptation and suggestion toucheth our minds, and knocketh at the doore of the heart, and seeketh to moue the will to consent to sinne, which notwithstanding is at it owne libertie to admit or reiect the same, so are the influences of Gods preuenting grace, whether suddaine or more constant, which do beat and knock at the heart, but so, as it is left in the libertie of the will to accept, or refuse,* euen in as plaine tearms as *Pelagius* said, [r] *that to consent to God consisteth in mans Free will, and that by libertie of nature hee doth so if he will.* This paines I haue taken to vnhood *M. Bishop* and his Counsel of Trent, & to make good that that I haue before affirmed, that the Church of Rome now maintaineth the heresie of *Pelagius* which anciently was condemned by the Church of Rome. That in which he alleadgeth out of *Thomas Aquinas* is of the same stampe, neither can his antiquitie of three hundred yeeres adde any grace to that which eight hundred yeares before him was vniuersally condemned by the whole Church. Whether *M. Perkins* his reasons doe destroy their assertion of *Free will*, vpon determining the state of the question in the next section it shall appeare.

q *Coster. Enchirid. c. 3. Sicut damon tentationis mentem nostram prauis cogitationes & concupiscentijs mens tangit ac pulsat afficereq; conatur voluntatem vt in peccatum consentiat, qua sua libertate motiones has omnes & admittere potest & reijcere: ita sunt in nobis diuini quidam influxus aliquando quidem repetiti, aliquādo cōstātiores, qui cor nostrū pulsant, rectā interim voluntatē sua libertate qua fieri potest vt vel suscipiantur vel repulsam patiantur.* r *Agust. Epist. 107. Consentire hominis libero arbitrio constitutum est, &c. Libertate naturali si vult facit, si non vult, non facit.*

## 6. W. Bishop.

*Now the very point controuersed, concerning* Free will, M. Perkins *hath quite omitted, which consisteth in these two points, expressed in the Councell: First, whether we doe freely assent vnto the said grace, when it is offered vs, that is, whether it lie in our power to refuse it; And secondly, when we concurre and worke with it, whether we could if we listed refuse to worke with it. In both which points we hold the affirmatiue part, and most sectaries of this time the negatiue. Of which our Author is silent: only by the way in his fourth reason, toucheth two texts out of S. Paul, which are commonly alleadged against Free will.*

## R. Abbot.

This true point of the controuersie is contained in the proposition of the Pelagians, that [a] *to consent to the Gospel is not the gift of God*

a *Aug. ep. 107. Vt Euangelio consentiamus non est donum Dei, sed hoc nobis est à nobis, id est, ex propria voluntate, quam nobis in nostro corde non operatus est ipse:*

God, but that this we haue of our ſelues, that is to ſay, of our owne will, which he hath not wrought for vs in our hearts. For thus you haue, *M. Biſhop*, all this while affirmed, that grace hauing performed and done what appertaineth to it for the conuerſion of man, there is behind a diſtinct and proper act of the will, which either by conſenting and yeelding maketh good, or by diſſenting and refuſing maketh fruſtrate all that grace hath done. This you all inculcate and beat vpon that, that when God hath wholly done his part, it is in mans will either to make or marre; and ſo doe plainly teach with *Pelagius*, that God doth helpe [b] *poſsibilitatem naturæ, our naturall power*, that we may be able to conſent and will, but actually to conſent and will, is left ſtill free to our owne will and choice. And thus, *M. Biſhop*, you your ſelfe informe vs, when propounding the firſt part of the queſtion *Whether we do freely aſſent vnto grace when it is offered vs, that is, whether it lie in our power to refuſe it*, you hold affirmatiuely, that by *Free will* wee aſſent vnto grace, hauing it in our power and choice to refuſe the ſame. Whether this bee ſo or not is the point, and wee reſolue with S. *Auſtin*, [c] *that God doth not onely giue vs, and helpe vs to be able to will and to worke, but alſo worketh in vs to will and to worke*: hee doth not ſo offer vs grace, as to leaue vs to aſſent vnto it if we will, but himſelfe worketh alſo in vs to bee willing, and to giue our aſſent vnto it, who [d] *ſo hath our hearts in his power, as that in wonderfull and vnſpeakeable manner hee worketh in vs to will that good that we cannot haue but with our will.* And whereas you ſay that *it lieth in our power to refuſe the grace of God*, you thereby ſubiect [e] *the accompliſhment of the promiſe of the grace of God, to the power and will of man*: ſo that if man liſt, it ſhall take place; if man liſt not, it ſhall not take place. [f] *God promiſed children to Abraham, that ſhould follow the ſteps of his faith.* [g] *He promiſed them forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, obedience, perſeuerance, the feare of him.* He offereth grace to that purpoſe, where if it *lie in mans power to refuſe the ſame*, then it muſt be in mans *power whether the promiſe of God ſhall be fulfilled* or not. But God did [h] not *make that promiſe vpon the power of our will*, as foreſeeing what wee would doe, but *vpon his owne purpoſe*, determining what *he himſelfe would doe, cauſing men to doe what he hath commanded, not hauing from men to per-*

[b] *Idem de grat. Chriſti cont. Pelag. & Celeſt. lib. 1. cap. 25.*
[c] *Idem. ibid. Non ſolùm Deus poſſe noſtrum donauit atque adiuuat ſed etiam velle & operari operatur in nobis.*
[d] *De prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 20. Cum Deus vult aliquid fieri quod nonniſi volentibus hominibus oportet fieri, inclinantur eorum corda vt hoc velint, eo ſcilicet inclinante, qui in nobis mirabili modo & ineffabili operatur & velle. Et de bono perſeuer. cap. 23. ſic in poteſtate habet cor noſtrum &c.*
[e] *De prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 10. per hoc vt promiſſa ſua Deus poſſit implere non eſt in Des ſed in hominis poteſtate.*
[f] *Ibid. Filios promiſit Deus Abrahæ qui fidei eius veſtigia ſequerentur.*
[g] *Proſp. de vocat. gent. lib. 1. cap. 3. Credituros promiſit, &c. reconciliandos promiſit, obedituros. perſeueraturos, &c.*
[h] *Auguſt. ibid. Non de noſtræ voluntatis poteſtate, ſed de ſua prædeſtinatione promiſit. Promiſit enim quod ipſe facturus fuerat, non quod homines; quia etſi faciunt homines bona quæ pertinent ad colendum Deum, ipſe facit vt illi faciant quæ præcepit, non illi faciunt vt ipſe faciat quod promiſit.*

forme

*some what he hath promised*, because he intended such *a grace*, not *as whereby man may attaine to righteousnesse if he will*, but *whereby it is wrought in him to will and leone the same*; *he hauing in his power the wils of men more then they themselues haue*. In a word, man by nature hath in him to resist and refuse the grace of God: to this his power serueth, and doth not serue to doe otherwise. But God ouer-ruleth this power, and worketh in him not to refuse his grace, and when God worketh in man not to *refuse*, it cannot be said, that to *refuse* is in the power of man; not that God maketh man iust against his will, but [l] *he taketh away from him hardnesse of heart, whereby he did refuse, and is* [m] *altogether inflexible towards God*, and giueth him *a new heart, a heart of flesh* willing to obey, whereby a man groweth to bee as aduerse to sinne, as hee was before to righteousnesse, and entreth to that state which *Saint Iohn* describeth, [n] *Euery one that is borne of God sinneth not, neither can he sinne*, that is, serue sinne, giue himselfe altogether ouer to sinne, *because hee is borne of God*, which is heere the happie beginning of the euerlasting blessed state of Gods elect; [o] *Non posse peccare, non posse bonum deserere, to be freed from all possibilitie of sinne, or forsaking that good* that God hath yeelded vnto vs by Iesus Christ. Now heereby wee see how absurdly *M. Bishop* propoundeth the second part of this question, *when we concurre to worke with grace, whether wee could, if wee listed, refuse to worke with it*. For who doubteth but if *we list, we doe refuse*? but therefore the worke of grace is that wee shall not *list to refuse* the worke of grace, but that our *list* shall bee to submit our selues vnto it. [p] *Where Christ praieth for Peter that his faith might not faile, will any man dare to say that it might faile if Peter list to haue it faile, that is, would not haue it to perseuere vnto the end? As if Peter could list or will in any sort otherwise then Christ had praied for him that he might will. For who knoweth not, that Peters faith should faile if the will of faith should faile in him, and continue, if that should continue? But because the will is prepared by the Lord, therefore the praier of Christ for Peter could not be in vaine, whereby hee praied that he might haue in the faith a most free, most strong, inuincible and perseuering will.* This is the worke of grace to all the faithfull: it standeth

i Idem de corrept. & grat. c.11. Secunda plus potest, qua fit etiam vt velit.

k Ibid.c.14. Magis habet in potestate voluntates hominum, quàm ipsi suas.

l De praedest. sanct. c.8. A nullo duro corde respuitur: ideo quippe tribuitur vt cordis duritia primitus auferatur.

m De grat. & lib. arbit.cap.14. Cor lapideum aduersus Deum omninò inflexibile est.

n 1.Joh.3.9.

o Aug. de corrept. & grat.c.11. Prima libertas voluntatis erat posse non peccare: nouissima multò maior erit non posse peccare, &c.

p Augusl. de corrept.& grat. ca.8. An audebis dicere etiam rogante Christo ne deficeret fides Petri, de facturam fuisse si Petrus eam deficere voluisset, hoc est, si eam vsq; in finem perseuerare noluisset? Quasi aliud Petrus vllo modo vellet quàm pro illo Christus rogasset vt vellet? Nam quis ignorat tunc fuisse perituram fidem Petri, si ea quae finalis erat voluntas ipsa defic.eret, & permansurum, si eadem vo'untas mansuraret? sed quia praeparatur voluntas à Domino, ideo pro illo non posset esse inanis oratio. Quando rogauit ergo ne fides eius deficeret, quid aliud rogauit, nisi vt haberet in fide liberrimam, fortissimam, inuictissimam, perseuerantissimam voluntatem?

not vpon their *list* to refuse the grace of God, for then they cer-
q Jerem.32.40. tainly giue it ouer, but q *hee putteth his feare into their hearts, that they shall not depart from him.* Now the question being truely and rightly propounded, *whether God hauing fully done his part for the conuersion of a sinner, it remaine free to his owne will, either to accept or refuse this grace*: the reasons vsed by *M. Perkins* are very effectuall and strong to proue the contrarie, and it was *M. Bishops* cunning to passe by them, because he knew not any probable answer to giue vnto them. His first reason sheweth the vniuersall
r Gen.6.5. corruption of mans heart, r *the whole imagination whereof* God testi-
f Rom.8.7. fieth to bee *onely euill continually*; *so that* f *flesh sauoureth of nothing but enmitie against God, and is not subiect to the Law of God, nor indeed can be.* If mans heart be *onely euill and enmitie against God*, then can it not be truly said, that there is in it any naturall facultie of *Free will*, to assent and yeeld it selfe to the grace of God. If it bee *not subiect to the law of God, nor indeed can bee*, shall wee say by plaine contradiction, that it hath in it whereby to assent and giue it selfe in submission vnto God? *Free will* requireth integritie in iudgement of vnderstanding, in election of will, in obedience of affection; but here man is vtterly disabled in all these. What faculty of iudgement hath hee to conceiue and approoue the things of God, who in all his thoughts is *onely euill*, and in his very *wisedome* is ene-
t Jerem.10.14. mie vnto God? t *Euery man is a beast by his owne vnderstanding, his*
u Ephes.4.18. *minde* altogether u *darknesse and ignorance*; and as he auaileth nothing that offereth light to the blind, or bringeth him into the cleerest Sunne-shine, vnlesse hee can make him see; so it booteth not that God doth set his light before man, and causeth it most
x Psal.119.18.27. cleerely to shine vnto him, vnlesse hee x *open the inward eie* of the soule, and *make him* to vnderstand; not leaue him to vnderstand if hee will, but *make him to vnderstand*. To this purpose is the second
y 1.Cor.2.14. reason of *M. Perkins*, that y *the naturall man perceiueth not the things of the spirit of God; that they are foolishnesse vnto him; that hee cannot*
z Vers.10.12. *know them because they are only spiritually*, that is, z *by the spirit to bee discerned*. If there be no free wil in spirituall things, without iudging and discerning, and vnderstanding thereof, and there bee no discer-
a Vers.16. ning or vnderstanding thereof, but onely by the a *spirit and minde of Christ*, surely in nature there can bee no *Free will* that can bee helpefull vnto vs, to the attainment of spirituall life, and the power ther-

of

of ſerueth but to condemne for folly the counſels and inſtructions thereto tending, the wiſdome whereof it is not able to apprehend. Let grace doe what may be done, yet nature perceiueth nothing of the ſpirit, if the ſame ſpirit of grace worke not therein to perceiue. Now where the vnderſtanding is capable, yet what peruerſeneſſe and croſneſſe ſtill remaineth in the will? It hood-winketh the minde, and maketh it ſeeme to it ſelfe not to ſee when it doth ſee; it ſhutteth the gates, and intercepteth the paſſages of the vnderſtanding, ſhunning to admit any thing whereby it ſhould bee checked and interrupted in it courſe; [b] *it hateth and is afraid to vnderſtand, that it may not be vrged to doe when it doth vnderſtand.* Yea where the conſcience is conuicted by knowledge and vnderſtanding, yet the will being entangled with it owne reſpects, how mightily doth it ſtruggle and fight againſt God? and neuer ceaſeth fighting, till God doe [c] *heale the rebellions of it*, not by putting it in caſe to yeeld if it will, but working in it to will and to yeeld vnto him. And when will hath now begun to yeeld, what vntowardlineſſe doth it finde in the affections, which as a ſwift and mightie ſtreame, doe euery while ouerbeare both the iudgement of the vnderſtanding, and the reſolution of the will, ſo that [d] *wee cannot doe the things that we would.* The peruerſeneſſe whereof, if it preuaile ſo much with men iuſtified and in the ſtate of grace, as that it cauſeth many bitter lamentations for ouerſights thereby committed contrarie to the intendment of the will, how much more doe they like flattering Dalilaes, binde all our ſtrength, and ouercome all the power of nature, when the will as yet hath receiued no fortification of inward grace to reſiſt and fight againſt them? Seeing therefore the heart is on the one ſide ſo blinde that it cannot ſee, and on the other ſide ſo peruerſe, as that one while it will not ſee, another while croſſeth whatſoeuer it doth ſee, wee may well ſay as *S. Auſtin* doth: [e] *What good may a man doe out of a heart that is not good? but to haue our heart good, we muſt looke to him that ſaith, I will giue you a new heart, and will put into you a new ſpirit*: ſo that till the heart bee renewed and made good, there is no doing good, and therefore no aſſenting to the grace of God. The third argument of *M. Perkins* he omitteth with the reſt, and yet lighting vpon ſome idle deuice afterwards, he thought good to ſet it downe in ſtead of an obiection, which ſhall bee examined in the place which he hath giuen it.

b *Aug. de verb. Apoſt. ſerm. 13. Impia mens odit etiam ipſum intellectum, & homo aliquando minimum mente perueſa timet intelligere, ne cogatur quod intellexerit facere.*

c Oſe. 14. 5.

d Gal. 5. 17.

e *Auguſt. contr. duas epiſt. Pelag. lib. 4. cap. 6. Quid poteſtis boni facere de corde non bono? vt autem habeatis cor bonum; Dabo inquit, &c.*

it. The fourth reason is taken from that that *the Scripture in the conuersion of a sinner ascribeth all to God, and nothing at all to mans Free will*, as appeareth from the termes of [f] *new birth*, [g] *new creation*, [h] *regeneration, &c.* Whereby is argued, that as man conferreth nothing to his generation and birth; so neither doth hee to his regeneration and new birth. As man doth nothing for himselfe in his creation, so hath hee nothing whereby to stead himselfe to become *a new creature*. Whereto agreeth the definition of the ancient Church: [i] *Wee in no wise suffer, nay according to wholesome doctrine, wee forbid, whether in our faith or in our workes, to challenge to our selues any thing as our owne.* Wee haue to challenge nothing as our owne; and therefore it is not our act of *Free will*, but Gods worke in vs to assent to the grace of God. How then doth *M. Bishop* say, that this is nothing against him, who saith in effect the same that *Pelagius* did, [k] *It is of God that we are able to doe or speake or to thinke any thing that is good: but to doe, or to speake, or to thinke, it is our owne*, because, if wee beleeue him, the grace of God leaueth it to our owne Free will, either to accept or refuse, to doe or not to do, to worke with it, or not to worke. *M. Perkins* fift reason is taken from the iudgement of the ancient Church; which how far it auaileth wee shall see anon: but hee that well weigheth these reasons, and the circumstances of them, as *M. Perkins* hath set them downe, will surely thinke, that either *M. Bishop* was not well awake, or his wits heere in the beginning of his booke were not yet well come to him, when he passed them ouer with this opinion, that *they were all for them*. But hee thought hee had a long way to goe, and was loth in the beginning to put himselfe out of breath.

f John 3.3.
g Gal.6.15.
h Tit.3.5.

i Fulgent. ad Monimum. l.1. Nullatenus suasimus, imò salubriter prohibemus tam in nostra fide, quàm in nostro opere, tanquã nostrum nobis aliquid vendicare:

k Aug. contr. Pelag. & Celest. li.1. cap 25. Quòd possumus omne bonũ facere, dicere, cogitare, illius est qui hoc posse donauit; quòd verò bene vel agimus, vel loquimur, vel cogitamus, nostrum est.

## 7. W. Bishop.

1.Cor.15.

*The first*: I haue (*saith hee*) laboured more abundantly then all they, yet not I, but the grace of God which is in me, *attributing the whole worke to grace. To which I briefly answer, that they doe corrupt the text, to make it seeme more currant for them: the Greeke hath only* He son emoi, *which is*, with mee, *not*, which is in mee, *so that the words in true construction make much more for vs then against vs.* Saint Paul *affirming the grace of God, which was working with him, to haue done these things: And so* Saint Augustine, *whom they pretend to follow*

most

*most in this matter, expounded it.* Yet not I, but the grace of God with mee; *that is*, not I alone, but the grace of God with mee. And by this, neither the grace of God alone: neither hee alone, but the grace of God with him: *thus* S. Augustine. *The like sentence is in the booke of Wisdome.* Send that (wisdome) from thy Holy heauen, that it may be with me, and labour with me. *De grat. & lib. arb. cap. 15.* *Cap. 9.*

## R. Abbot.

Corruption of texts is not wont to be but for aduantage. It is no aduantage more to vs to reade [a] *the grace of God which is in mee*, then to reade *the grace of God which is with mee.* The ancient father *Hierom* readeth it both waies: one where, [b] *the grace of God which is in me*: another where, [c] *the grace of God which is with mee*, as betwixt which in effect there is no difference. To reade, *the grace of God which is in mee*, though it doe not heere literally answere the Greeke, yet hath no other meaning but what the Apostle elsewhere iustifieth by the same phrase of speech; [d] *Now I liue; yet not I, but Christ liueth in mee*: yea and in the same place immediatlie before, we haue literall example of it; [e] *His grace which is in me. The words in true construction*, saith *M. Bishop, make much more for vs then against vs.* And why so? Forsooth because S. *Paul affirmeth the grace of God which was working with him, to haue done these things.* But how is that for them? For if his meaning bee, that because it is said, that *grace did worke with him*, therefore it must bee also vnderstood, that *hee did worke with grace*, hee must remember that hee hath said before, [f] *By the grace of God I am that I am*, and therefore that it was of *grace it selfe*, that hee did *worke with grace.* As if he should haue said, *I haue laboured more abundantly then they all, yet I can attribute nothing to my selfe heerein, but all to grace, because it is the worke of grace in mee what soeuer I haue done, in working with grace.* [g] *Fearing least the worke should bee ascribed to himselfe*, saith the Scholiast, *hee referreth it to the grace of God.* To which purpose the same Apostle elsewhere saith: [h] *I haue whereof to reioice in Christ Iesus, in the things that pertaine to God: for I dare not speake of any thing which Christ hath not wrought by mee, &c.* Where *Photius* thus obserueth; [i] *He sheweth that nothing is his, but all wholy is Christs.* If all wholie bee of Christ, then is no part to bee ascribed to

[a] 1. Cor. 15. 10.
[b] *Hieron. adu. Iouinian. lib. 2.*
[c] *Idem. ad princip. explanat. Psal. 44. & adu. Pelag. lib. 2.*
[d] Gal. 2. 20.
[e] 1. Cor. 15. 10. ἡ χάρις ἡ σὺν ἐμοί.
[f] *Ibid.*
[g] *Oecumen. in 1. Cor. cap. 15. Veritus ne rectum opus sibi attribueretur, gratiæ Dei ipsum fert acceptum.*
[h] Rom. 15. 17.
[i] *Photius apud Oecumen. in Ro. cap. 15. ostendit quòd nihil eras ipsius sed totum Christi.*

to the *Free will* of man. The Pelagians vrged this place to the Corinthians with the ſame pretence that *M. Biſhop* doth. Let him take the anſwer of *Oroſius* as ſpoken to him: [k] *Thou heedleſſe preſumptuous man, what doſt thou looke at that he ſaith, with me? Marke well that he hath firſt ſaid, Not I. Betwixt, not I, and, with mee, commeth in the middeſt, the grace of God, whoſe indeede it is both to will and to worke for the making of a good will, albeit the will bee the will of man. Wherefore he was bolde to ſay, with me, becauſe hee had ſaid, not I. So then the grace of Gods power worketh in the will of man, which hath giuen to it to will the ſame. Whereupon the conſcience of man profeſſeth and ſaith, not I, but the grace of God giueth him that hee may ſay, with mee. Paul* then ſaith and may ſay, *with mee*, but it is not by any proper act of his owne *Free will*, but by the onelie gift and worke of grace, whereby he attaineth to ſay, *with mee*. And no otherwiſe would *S. Auſtine* haue ſpoken, if hee had not fallen into huckſters hands, who vſe him onely for aduantage, and not for truth. For hauing in hand to ſhew, that God calling vs, and iuſtifying vs onely by his grace, vſeth thenceforth our will and worke to accompanie his grace, in going forward with the worke of our ſaluation, giueth for example hereof the Apoſtle S. *Paul*, who profeſſing that *by Gods meere grace hee was all that hee was* towards God, ſheweth that hauing receiued this grace, it was not idle in him, but he *laboured more aboundantly then all* the reſt, but adding, *yet not I, but the grace of God with mee*; [l] *that is*, ſaith *Auſtine*, *not I alone, but the grace of God with mee; and therefore neither the grace of God alone, nor hee himſelfe alone, but the grace of God with him*. Now the next words are; *But that hee was called from heauen, and by that mightie and moſt effectuall calling was conuerted, Gratia Dei erat ſola, it was onelie the grace of God.* Which words *M. Biſhop* hath fraudulentlie concealed, as being expreſſie againſt him, and cleering this whole point moſt manifeſtly on our part. Our conuerſion is onelie by the grace of God, as *Auſtine* ſaith S. *Pauls* was; *Free will hath no part therein.* Wee ſay as hee ſaith, that the will of man beeing conuerted and renewed by grace, doth afterwards apply it ſelfe to worke with grace, and ſo there is not onelie the grace of God, nor onelie the will of man, but the grace of God accompanied with the will of man, not as by any proper worke of the will it ſelfe, but by the worke

k *Oroſ. Apologet. de arbit. libert. Quid incaute præſumptor aſpicis, quia dixerit, mecum? Attende quia præmiſerit, Non ego. Quapropter in hac alio verba, Non ego, & mecum, gratia Dei media eſt; cuius eſt velle & perficere pro bona voluntate et tamen voluntate hominis. Unde & ille confiſus eſt vt diceret, mecum, quia dixerat, Non ego. In voluntate ergo hominis gratia diuinæ virtutis operatur, quæ & hoc ipſum velle donauit. Ita conſcientia hominis profitetur vt dicat, Non ego: gratia Dei largitur vt mecum.*

l *Aug. de grat. & lib. arbit. cap. 5. Id eſt, non ſolus ſed gratia Dei mecum: ac per hoc nec gratia Dei ſola, nec ipſe ſolus ſed gratia Dei cum illo. Vt autem de cœlo vocaretur & tam magna & efficaciſſima vocatione conuerteretur, gratia Dei erat ſola, &c.*

worke of grace, by which it was first conuerted. Therefore the same *S. Austine* elsewhere mentioning those words, *By the grace of God I am that I am*, saith thereupon: [m] *This is the first mercie, after which doe follow the workes of Free will. But that good workes might follow after the calling of the Apostle, what doth hee say himselfe? And his grace was not in mee in vaine.* There is no *Free will* then to righteousnesse, before a man can say, *By the grace of God I am that I am.* Thereby the will is made *free*, and thereby it worketh with grace to bring foorth the fruites of all good workes. So that Saint *Austine* leaueth vs this place verie strong to proue that both our conuersion, and our working with grace, when wee are conuerted, is altogether and wholy to bee attributed vnto grace. Heereby the other place is cleered, if it were ought worth.

[m] *Dep redest. & grat. cap. 11. Hoc est prima misericordia quam liberæ voluntatis opera cõsequuntur. Sed vt Pauli vocationem bona opera sequerentur, quid ait: Et gratia eius, &c.*

## 8. W. Bishop.

*The second text is.* It is God that worketh in vs, both to will and to accomplish. *Wee grant that it is God, but not hee alone without vs: for in the next wordes before, Saint* Paul, *saith:* Worke your saluation with feare and trembling. *So that God worketh principally by stirring vs vp by his grace, and also helping forward our will, to accomplish the worke; but so sweetlie and conformably to our nature, that his working taketh not away, but helpeth forward our will to concurre with him. Againe, the whole may bee attributed vnto God, considering that the habits of grace infused, bee from him as sole efficient cause of them, our actions indued also with grace, beeing onely dispositions and no efficient cause of those habits: but this is an high point of schoole Diuinitie, verie true, but not easilie to bee conceiued of the vnlearned.* Phil. 2. v. 13.

## R. Abbot.

*S. Austine* in expresse termes contradicteth *M. Bishop*, saying, [a] *vt velimus sine nobis operatur: without vs he worketh in vs to will.* And so *S. Bernard* also saith, that [b] *the creating of vs to freedome of will, is wrought without vs.* Our will is the subiect wherein it is wrought, but the efficient cause thereof is onely the grace of God. This *M. Bishop* denieth, because the Apostle in the words immediathe be-

[a] *Aug. de grat. & li. arbit. cap. 17:* [b] *Bernard. de grat. & lib. arbit. Creatio (in libertatem voluntatis) facta est & sine nobis.*

fore ſaith, *Worke out your ſalnation with feare and trembling.* But the Apoſtle when he biddeth them *to worke*, biddeth them to do it *with feare and trembling.* And why is that? [e] *The Apoſtle addeth the cauſe*, ſaith *S. Auſtine : for it is God that worketh in you to will and to worke, of his owne goodwill. If then God worke in thee, it is by the grace of God that thou workeſt well, not by thine owne power.* How peruerſly then doth *M. Biſhop* deale, that when the Apoſtle vſeth the latter words to expoundeth former, he will take the former words to croſſe the latter? Men are to bee called vpon by exhortation to doe good workes, but yet they are to knowe, that the effect of exhortation, is the worke of grace. True, ſaith *M. Biſhop*, it is of grace, but not of grace onely: for *Free will* alſo hath a part. But *S. Auſtin* telleth, that [d] *it is more ſafe tie for vs to attribute all wholy to God, and not committe our ſelues partlie to God, and partly to our ſelues :* and [e] *true faith requireth this in the defending of one God, that whatſoeuer is his, we make it onely his : for ſo ſhall it be accounted his, if it be accounted onely his.* If God do worke in vs to will, let vs acknowledge it to bee his onely, and none of ours. *God worketh principally*, ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *by ſtirring vs vp by his grace, and alſo helping forward our will to accompliſh the worke, but ſo ſweetly and conformably to our nature, that his working taketh not away, but helpeth forward our will to concurre with him.* Heere is *ſtirring vp* the will, *and helping forward the will*, and no more but what the Pelagians confeſſed, as I haue ſhewed before: but why doth he make it ſo daintie, to ſay as the Apoſtle ſaith that *God worketh in vs to will?* Hee nameth *grace*, which is but a grace *if wee will*, but wee require the grace which the Apoſtle teacheth, whereby *God worketh in vs to will.* Hee ſaith, that *God doth not take away our will.* So did *Pelagius* ſay: [f] *that God doth not work holineſſe in vs without our will.* Wee anſwer, that our will is the ſubiect wherein God worketh, as before was ſaid, but it is no part of the efficient cauſe, whereby it is wrought in vs to will. The Arauſicane Councell determineth, [g] *that if any man doe maintaine, that God expecteth our will that we may bee purged from ſinne, and doth not confeſſe, that by the infuſion and operation of the holie Ghoſt it is alſo wrought in vs to bee willing to bee purged, he reſiſteth the Apoſtle, in that hee preacheth according to wholeſome doctrine, that it is God which worketh in vs, both to will & to worke, of his good will.* This *M. Biſhop* maintaineth: he ſaith that God offereth grace to that purpoſe, but expecteth our will to make

e *Aug. in Pſa. 65. Subiecit cauſam, Deus eſt enim, &c. Si ergo Deus operatur in te, gratia Dei bene operaris non viribus tuis.*

d *De lom perſeueran. cap. 6. Tutiores vtiſimus ſi totū Deo damus, & non nos illi ex parte & nobis ex parte committimus.*

e *Tertul. aduerſ. Hermog. Veritas ſic vnum Deum exigit defendendo vt ſolius ſit quicquid ipſius eſt: ita enim ipſius erit ſi ſuerit ſolus.*

f *Aug. cont. Pel. & Cœleſt. lib. 1. ca. 7. Dicimus eam ſine voluntate noſtra nequaquam in nobis perficere ſanctitatem*

g *Concil. Arauſican. 2. cap. 4. Si quis vt à peccato purgemur voluntatem noſtram, Deum expectare contendit: Non autem vt etiam purgari velimus per ſancti Spiritus infuſionem & operationem in nobis fieri confitetur, reſiſtet etiam Apoſtolo, &c.*

make good that grace to our ſelues: he confeſſeth that God *ſtirreth and helpeth forward our will*, but cannot endure to ſay, that it is God that worketh in vs to *will*. He anſwereth yet further, *that the whole may be attributed to God, becauſe the habits of grace infuſed, be frō him as ſole efficient of thē, our actiōs endued alſo with grace, being only diſpoſitions, & no efficient cauſe of thoſe habits*. But herein he abſurdly trifleth, by altering the ſtate of the queſtiō. For the controuerſie is not of the efficient cauſe of infuſed grace, but of the efficient cauſe of our receiuing that grace. We ſay, that the holy Ghoſt worketh the ſame immediatly in our will; they ſay, that the grace of God and the Free will of man make [k] *one efficient cauſe* of the receiuing thereof. They ſay, that God offereth his grace with conditon *if we will*; but we ſay, that God without putting vs to condition of our wil, worketh in vs to will, and where he expreſſeth a condition doth himſelfe performe the ſame [l] *giuing what he commandeth, and* [k] *himſelfe making vs to do what he requireth to be done*. The words of the Apoſtle are plain for vs, and as plaine againſt them. Now it ſhould ſeeme that their diuinitie is verie low, where it is ſo high a point, and not eaſie for the vnlearned to conceiue, that God is the onely efficient cauſe of all infuſed grace. But I take it to be but a point of *M. Biſhops* cunning thus to ſpeake, yet his learning will gaine but ſmall credit thereby.

[k] *Andrad. Orth. explicat. lib. 4. Ex gratia & libero arbitrio vnica cauſa conſtatur noſtræ ad iuſtitiam applicationis.*

[l] *Aug. Confeſſ. lib. 10. cap. 29. Da quod iubes.*

[k] *De prædeſtinat. cap. 11. Deus facit, vt illa faciamus. Ad Epheſ. 1. 2.*

9. W. BISHOP.

*One other obiection may be collected out of* M. Perkins *third reaſon againſt Free will, which is touched, as hee ſaith, by the holie Ghoſt, in theſe words*: When we were dead in ſinnes. *If a man by ſinne become like a dead man, he cannot concurre with* God, *in his riſing from ſinne.*

Anſw. *Sure it is, that he cannot, before God by his grace hath quickned, & as it were, reuiued him, to which grace of God, man giues his free conſent. How can that be, if hee were then dead? Marry you muſt remember what hath been ſaid before: that albeit man in ſinne be dead in the way of grace, yet hee liueth naturallie, and hath Free will in naturall and ciuil actions: which will of his being by grace fortified, & as it were lifted vp vnto a higher degree of perfection, can then concurre and worke with grace to faith, and all good workes neceſſarie to life euerlaſting. (As for exampl'e) a Crab-tree ſtocke hath no abilitie of it ſelfe, to bring forth apples, & therefore may be tearmed dead in that kinde of good fruite: yet let a ſtance of apples be grafted into it, and it will beare apples: euen ſo albeit our ſoure corrupt nature of it ſelfe be vnable to fructifie to life euerlaſting*

Cap. 1. *uerlasting, yet hauing receiued into it the heauenly graft of Gods grace, it is enabled to produce the sweete fruite of good workes: to which alludeth S.* Iames: Receiue the ingraffed word, which can saue our soules. *Againe*, what more dead then the earth? *& yet it being tilled and sowed, doth bring forth, and beare goodly corne: now the word and* Mat. 13. *grace of God is compared by our Sauiour himselfe vnto seede, and our hearts vnto the earth that receiued it: what maruel then if we otherwise dead, yet reuiued by this liuely seede, do yeeld plenty of pleasing fruit?*

R. Abbot.

This obiection *M. Bishop* saith, hee collecteth out of *M. Perkins* third reason against *Free will*, whereas it is indeede the whole matter of that third reason. He would haue kept due order, and haue answered the rest as well as this, but that hee doubted hee should haue answered the rest as badly as he hath done this. Hee propoundeth the obiection at his owne liking, and cutteth off what hee list. *If man by sinne become like a dead man, he cannot concur with God in his rising from sinne.* For this the words of the Apostle are alleaged by *M. Perkins*, [a] *When we were dead in sinnes. M. Bishop* answereth *sure it is that he cannot, before God by his grace hath quickened and as it were reuiued him, to which grace of God man giueth his free consent.* a Ephes. 2. 1. Which answer, who is so blind as that hee cannot see how absurdlie it crosseth it selfe? Man must giue his free consent to grace, that he may be quickened thereby; and yet man cannot consent or concur with God, before he be quickened by grace. If man cannot consent or concurre with God before he be quickened, then the consent of of his owne *Free will* cannot bee the efficient cause of his quickening, because that that commeth after, cannot be the cause of that that necessarily goeth before, and the effect is neuer the cause of it own cause. And this is indeed the verie truth, iustified by *M. Bishops* owne words, against his will. But his whole discourse driueth the other way, that a man not yet quickened, must by Free will giue consent to grace, and concurre with God, that hee may be quickened; because though grace be offered, yet it taketh no effect vntill our *Free will* doe make way for it, and doe adde it owne indeauour and helpe to the worke thereof. Which is all one as to require of a dead bodie to giue consent, and to put to it owne helpe for the restoring of it selfe to life againe. Yet hee thinketh to cleere the matter of all impossibilitie: for asking the question againe, *How can that be,*

*bee* (namely, that man ſhould giue his free conſent to grace) *if hee were then dead?* he anſwereth, *Marry you muſt remember what hath been ſaid before, that albeit man in ſinne be dead in the way of grace, yet hee liueth naturally, and hath Free will in naturall and ciuill actions.* But what is this to the purpoſe, ſeeing that *ſpiritually* hee ſtill continueth a *dead man?* Yea but *this will of his beeing fortified and lifted vp to a higher degree of perfection, can then concur and worke with grace to faith & all good workes neceſſarie to life euerlaſting.* Where he doth but runne in a ring, and in other words repeateth the ſame anſwer, ſtill ſticking faſt in the briers, wherein he was tangled before. For how is this will *to be fortified and lifted vp to a higher degree of perfection?* Hee hath told vs before, *by grace*, and that *to grace man muſt giue his free conſent*. So then he telleth vs that *Free will* cannot concurre and worke with grace, except by grace it be firſt fortified & lifted vp to a higher degree of perfection: and yet it cannot be fortified by grace, and lifted vp to a higher degree of perfection, except it firſt concurre with grace. I may here againe iuſtly returne vpon him his owne words, *See how vncertaine the ſteppes are of men that walke in darkneſſe, &c.* Now the Reader will obſerue that the obiection is of man *dead as touching Free will to righteouſneſſe*, and he anſwereth of *naturall Free will onely fortified and lifted vp to a higher degree of perfection.* What *fortifying is there of a dead man*, and how ſhould he be *lifted vp to a higher degree of perfection*, except hee firſt recouer life? Why doth hee by babling and trifling bobbe his Reader, and make ſhew to ſay ſomething, when indeed to the purpoſe he ſaith nothing at all? The argument ſtill ſtandeth impregnable. Man is not onely weake and vnperfect, but *dead*, not *halfe dead*, but *wholly dead in ſinne*, and therefore by *S. Auſtine* likened to the [b] *Shunamites ſon beeing dead*, whom the Prophet *Elizeus* raiſed from the dead. He muſt be made [c] *aliue from the dead*, before he can concurre with grace. Which if *M. Biſhop* confeſſe, or becauſe he cannot deny, therefore hee muſt confeſſe alſo, that as the dead man hath nothing whereby to helpe himſelfe to receiue life againe, ſo man ſpiritually *dead*, [d] *inwardly in ſoule dead*, hath nothing in him, no faculty or power of the ſoule, whereby hee can any way further the recouerie of his owne life. But to fill vp the meaſure of his folly, he will ſet foorth this matter vnto vs by a compariſon: *A Crab-tree ſtocke* (forſooth) *hath no ability of it ſelfe to bring fourth apples, and therefore*

[b] *Aug. contra duas Epiſt. Pela. lib. 4. cap 5. & de verbis Apoſt. Ser. 11.*

[c] Rom. 6. 13.

[d] *Auguſt. de verb. Dom. Ser. 18. Mortuus eſt vocat Vbi miſi intus in anima?*

*therefore may be tearmed dead in that kind of good fruite: yet let a ſiance of apples be grafted into it, and it will beare apples: euen ſo* (ſaith he) *albeit our ſowre corrupt nature of it ſelfe be vnable to fructifie to life euerlaſting, yet hauing receiued into it the heauenlie graft of Gods grace, it is enabled to bring foorth the ſweete fruite of good works. Similes habent labra lactucæ*: as his doctrine is, ſo muſt his ſimilitudes needs bee, crabbed and croſſe. Is the Crab-tree ſtocke *dead* to the bringing foorth of apples, which by it owne naturally life without alteration, continueth life, and giueth nouriture and increaſe to the ſiances and graffes of apples, that are engraffed and implanted vpon it? which receiueth nothing at all of the graffes or ſiances, but miniſtreth vnto them that, wherby they bring foorth fruite? Is this the condition of the grace of God in vs, that wee giue it ſappe and ſtrength in vs to bring foorth good fruite vnto God? And yet the Crab-tree ſtocke in the receiuing of the new graffes is meerelie and wholie paſſiue, and not actiue in any ſort. The engraffing thereof is altogether the worke of the gardiner or husbandman. Yea and that they bring foorth ſuch or ſuch fruite, they haue it not of the ſtocke, but altogether and onely of their owne kinde. Therefore we muſt likewiſe ſay, that the nature of man in the receiuing of the graft of grace, is altogether paſſiue and doth nothing thereto, and when [c] *the ſuperfluitie of maliciouſneſſe* beeing *caſt away and cut off*, the ſame grace vſeth our naturall powers to the bringing foorth of the fruite of good workes, the commendation of the fruite ariſeth only from the graffe, from grace it ſelfe and the power thereof, not by the ſtocke, but by it ſelfe, digeſting and turning all to the nature and qualitie of it ſelfe. So that his owne compariſon doth moſt effectually ſerue to ſtrengthen our part, and to ouerthrow his owne. But as he vſeth it, it ſauoureth very rankly of the Pelagian hereſie. For *Pelagius* made of the power of nature, [f] *a fertile and fruitfull roote, which out of the will of man did bring forth diuerſly, and might as the dreſſer thereof liſt, either bee garniſhed with the flowers of vertue, or elſe grow wild with the thornes of vice.* Whereby as *S. Auſtine* noteth, *he made one and the ſame roote, both of good and euill workes*, euen as *M. Biſhop* doth by his Crab-tree ſtocke, *contrarie to the truth of the Goſpell, and the doctrine of the Apoſtle.* For in the Goſpell we read of [g] *a good tree, and an euill tree, and that the good tree cannot bring foorth euill fruite, nor the euill tree good fruite.* [h] *The good*

tree

e Iam. 1. 21.

f *Auguſt. contra Pelag. & Celeſt. li. 1. ca. 8. Habemus poſſibilitatem vtriuſque partis à Deo inſitam velut quandam, vt ita dicam, radicã fructiferã atque fœcundam, quæ ex voluntate hominis diuerſa gignat & pariat, & quæ poſſit ad proprij cultoris arbitrium vel nitere flore virtutum, vel ſentibus horrere vitiorum. Vbi non intuens quid loquatur vnam eandemque radicem conſtituit bonorum & malorum, contra Euãgelicam veritatem, &c.*

g Mat. 7. 17. 18.

h *Quid eſt bonus homo niſi voluntatis bonæ, hoc eſt, arbor radicis bonæ? Et quid eſt homo malus niſi voluntatis malæ, hoc eſt, arbor radicis malæ?*

*tree is a tree of a good root, and the euill tree a tree of an euill root,* not both of the ſame root. *The tree of a good root is the man of a good will: the tree of an euill root is the man of euil will,* not growing both vpon the Crab-tree ſtocke of *M. Biſhops Free will.* Whereby wee are giuen to vnderſtand, that for the bringing foorth of good fruit, it ſufficeth not to haue any thing ingraffed in vs, but we our ſelues muſt become graffes, to bee implanted into a new ſtocke, and to grow vpon a new root. Wee muſt beengraffed into *the* [i] *true Vine Ieſus Chriſt,* by him to *bee purged* from the corruption that wee haue drawne from our old root, and to liue wholly by his ſpirit, that we may bring foorth fruit, not according to our own nature and kind, as other graffes doe, but according to a new life and nature, that we receiue by being ioined vnto him. *M. Biſhop* is of another mind; he will haue Chriſt to bee ingraffed vpon the Crab-tree ſtocke of our *Free will:* hee ſeeth no neceſſitie to leaue his old root to be engraffed into Chriſt. As for the place of *S. Iames,* [k] *Receiue the engraffed word, &c.* it auaileth him nothing at all: for it doth not import in any wiſe, that the word of God ingraffed in our naturall *Free will,* doth bring foorth fruit vnto God, but onely telleth vs in what ſort the word of God is to bee receiued of vs, that it may ſaue our ſoules: namely, that it muſt be inwardly wrought in our hearts, that it may become to vs [l] *the immortall ſeede,* whereby through faith wee are [m] *begotten and borne againe,* and [n] *created anew in Ieſus Chriſt,* which is not done [o] *by the will of man,* that is, by *Free will,* but God [p] *of his owne will hath begotten vs,* and that ſo, as that though [q] *Paul plant, and Apollo water, yet God onely giueth the increaſe, and neither he that planteth is any thing, nor he that watereth,* (which is in vaine ſpoken if he that is planted or watered be any thing by his owne *Free will*) but *God onely that giueth the increaſe.* Another compariſon he vſeth *of the earth What more dead,* ſaith he, *then the earth? and yet it being tilled and ſowne, doth bring foorth and beare goodly corne.* Whereof he maketh application thus: *Now the word and grace of God is compared by our Sauiour to ſeed, and our hearts to the earth that receiue it. What maruell then if we otherwiſe dead, yet reuiued by this liuely ſeed, do yeeld plentie of pleaſing fruit?* Where wee ſee how loth he is that the Pelagians in any abſurdity ſhould goe beyond him. As before hee made one root, ſo heere he maketh one ground of *Free will,* common and indifferent to good and euill, and which is ſtrange, maketh it as naturall

i Ioh.15.1.

k Iam.1.21.

l 1.Pet.1.23.

m Iam.1.18.

n Epheſ.2.10.

o Ioh.1.13.

p Iam.1.18.

q 1.Cor.3.6.

turall to this ground or earth to bring foorth fruit of the ſeed of Gods word, as it is to the tilled ground to yeeld corne of the ſeede that is ſowne vpon it. Moreouer, of *grace* he maketh no other matter but *the ſeed*, which is, *the word of God*, [r] *the law and doctrine, and exhortation*, euen as Pelagius did; and that by this *ſeed* of Gods word *Free will* is reuiued, to bring forth plentie of pleaſing fruit. But our Sauiour Chriſt in the Goſpell maketh foure ſorts of ground, and thereof one onely *good ground*, which is not good of it ſelfe, but made good, hauing nothing in it whereof to bring foorth fruit of the ſeed of Gods word, [f] *vntill the ſpirit be powred vpon it from aboue, that of a wilderneſſe it may become a fruitfull field.* So that *the grace of God* conſiſteth not in *the ſeed* of the word, but importeth a ſpirituall and heauenly influence of the bleſſing of God, altering and changing the nature of the ſoile of mans heart, that it may bee fit to receiue the ſeed, and to fructifie thereby. For otherwiſe the Scripture teacheth vs, that mans heart is a [t] *ſtonie heart*, that his [u] *forehead is braſſe, and his necke an iron ſinew*, and that to beſtow labour vpon him by the word of God, is but as to waſh [x] *an Æthiopian or a Leopard*, to take away the *blacknes and ſpots of them*, or to [y] *plow vpon the rocke*, where there is no entrance neither for plow nor ſeed. Therefore howſoeuer the *ſeed* be ſowne, it auaileth nothing, neither can the will of man fructifie thereby, vntill it do [z] *heare and learne of the Father to come to Chriſt*, [a] *that is, vntill it receiue a gift of the Father whereby to beleeue in Chriſt*, [b] *it being meant not of the very earth*, ſaith *Auſtin*, *but ſpiritually which is ſaid: The Lord will yeeld his ſweetneſſe, and our land or earth ſhall giue increaſe*, as to note, that not by any power of our *Free will*, but onely by his ſweet and heauenly dew, [c] *the raine of righteouſneſſe*, [d] *the raine of bleſſing*, which hee raineth vpon vs, we bring foorth fruit of the ſeed of the word of God.

r *Auguſt. contr. Pelag. & Celeſt. lib. 1. cap. 7. & Epiſt. 107. Gratiam Dei ponit in lege atque doctrina.*

f Eſa. 32. 15.

t Ezech. 36. 26.
u Eſa. 48. 4.

x Jerem. 13. 23.
y Amos 6. 12.
z Joh. 6. 45.
a *Auguſt. de Prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 8. Nihil eſt aliud quàm donum accipere à Patre quo credat in Chriſtum.*
b *Idem de peccat. mer. & remiſ. lib. 2. cap. 17. Sciat quàm verè non de terra iſta, ſed ſpiritualiter dictum ſit, Dominus dabit, &c.*
c Oſe. 10. 12.
d Ezech. 34. 26.

## 10. W. BISHOP.

*Hauing hitherto explicated the ſtate of the queſtion, and ſolued ſuch obiections as may be gathered out of* M. Perkins *againſt it, before I come to his ſolution of our arguments, I will ſet downe ſome principall places, both out of the Scriptures and ancient Fathers, in defenſe of our doctrine, becauſe he propoſeth but few for vs, and miſapplieth them too.*

Geneſ. 4. *Firſt then, God ſaith to* Caine: If thou do well, ſhalt thou not receiue

ceiue a reward? But if thou doe euill, thy ſinne will preſently bee at the gates, but the appetite of it ſhall bee vnder thee, and thou ſhalt beare dominion ouer it. *Heere is plaine mention made of the power, which that euill diſpoſed man* Caine *had, not to ſinne, if he had liſted; which was (no doubt) by the aſſiſtance of Gods grace, and on the other ſide, that grace did not infallibly draw him to good, but left it to his free choice, whether he won'd follow it or no. And becauſe they, who ſeeke out all manner of ſtarting holes, wreſt theſe words,* of ruling and bearing ſway, *as ſpoken of his brother* Abel, *and not of ſinne: firſt, to ſee their iniquitie, marke the text, where is no mention of* Abel, *neither in that verſe, nor in the next before; but expreſſe mention is made of ſinne in the next words before: therefore thoſe Pronounes (that are to bee referred to the words next before) muſt needes in true conſtruction be referred to ſinne, and not to his brother. Beſides this plaine conſtruction of the text,* S Auguſtine *followeth ſaying as it were to* Cain, Hold thy ſelfe content, for the conuerſion of it ſhall bee to thee, and thou ſhalt rule ouer it. What (*ſaith he*) ouer his brother? God forbid, that ſo wicked a man ſhould rule ouer ſo good: *Ouer what then?* but he ſhall rule ouer ſinne. *See how manifeſtly that worthy Doctour hath preuented their cauill. And if it were need, I might ioine with him that moſt skilfull Father in the Hebrew text,* S. Hierome, * *who in the perſon of God expoundeth it thus:* Becauſe thou haſt Free will, I admoniſh and warne thee, that thou ſuffer not ſinne to ouercome thee, but doe thou ouercome ſinne.

Lib. 15. de ciuit. Dei, cap. 7.

* In quæſt. Hebraic.

## R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins,* he ſaith, *propoſed but few places for them, and miſapplied them too; and therefore he will himſelfe ſet downe ſome principall places, both out of the Scriptures and Fathers, in defenſe of their doctrine.* But what ill happe had hee at firſt to light vpon an example, whereby as *Auſtin* noteth, it is ſo manifeſt, [a] *that howſoeuer God himſelfe doe ſpeake to the ſenſe of man, either to his outward or inward ſenſes, yet if he doe not by inward grace rule and worke the mind, all the preaching of truth auaileth nothing, and that it is the holy Ghoſt that muſt worke inwardly, that the medicine may auaile that is outwardly applied.*

[a] *Auguſt. de ciuit. Dei. li. 15. c. 16. Spiritus ſanctus operatur intrinſecus vt valeat aliquid medicina quæ adhibetur extrinſecus. aliquin etiamſi Deus ipſe vtens creatura ſibi ſubdita in aliqua ſpecie humana ſenſus alloquatur humanos, &c. nec interiore gratia mentem regat atque agat, nihil prodeſt homini omnis predicatio veritatis. Facit hoc Deus, à vaſis misericordiæ, ira vaſa diſcernens, &c. Et cap. 7. Hoc ipſum cùm Deus locutus eſſet ad Cain quid ei profuit, &c.*

Which

Which is a worke whereby God putteth *difference betwixt the vessels of mercie and the vessels of wrath*; so that the question why one receiueth the grace of God and another doth not, *is not answered by the vvilling or nilling of Free vvill*, as to say, one by *free vvill* would when God offered grace, the other would not, but by Gods working that in the one which he worketh not in the other, who *both haue by nature to nill and refuse, but neither haue to will but by the gift of God*; whereas with *M. Bishop*, the worke of God is the same to both, neither doth God make the difference betwixt man and man, offering himselfe alike to all, but man by Free will either receiuing or refusing, maketh difference betwixt himselfe and other men. God himselfe spake to *Cain*, yet was he not the better for it. *M. Bishop* telleth vs, that the reason was in his owne *Free* will, whereby he had it in his owne power, at his owne list to conuert and turne to God, and that God did signifie so much by saying vnto him, *that the desire of sinne should be vnder him, and he should beare dominion ouer it.* Where he should haue had regard for proofe of his doctrine, [c] *to make choice of plaine and manifest places*, as *S. Austins* rule is, *not of such as being figuratiue or obscure, may be expounded and taken diuersly*. There are sundry expositions of this place deliuered by the ancient fathers, and therefore there is no necessitie to vrge vs to take that exposition which he alledgeth. First, *Chrysostome* expoundeth the place according to the true meaning thereof, that God hauing by [d] the same phrase of speech constituted before the superioritie of the husband ouer his wife, doth heere yeeld to the first borne a superioritie and kinde of Lordship ouer the rest of his brethren, which heere he signifieth to *Cain*, hee would not infringe, to giue him occasion that way of offense towards his brother, howsoeuer hee accepted his brothers sacrifice better then his, albeit ready to accept his sacrifice also if hee offered in the like sort as his brother did. [e] *Thinke not, that because I haue refused thy sacrifice because of thy corrupt minde, and haue accepted thy brothers sacrifice because of his vpright and sound heart, therefore I will depriue thee of thy superioritie, and take away from thee the honour of thy birthright. For albeit I haue honoured him, and haue accepted his gifts, yet his turning shall bee to thee, and thou shalt haue dominion ouer him. And albeit thou hast sinned, yet I yeeld thee to enioy the priuileges of thy birthright, and doe appoint that hee shall be vnder*

[b] *Prosper. de vocat. Gent. li. 1. c. 9. Profunditas illius quæstionis per liberi arbitrij velle & nolle non soluitur, quia licet insit homini bonum nolle, tamen nisi donatum, non habet bonum velle.*

[c] *Aug. de vnitat. Eccles. cap. 5. Hoc prædico atq; propono, vt quæque aperta & manifesta deligamus. & cap. 9. Nec ita vt ex colligant & commemorent quæ obscurè vel ambiguè vel figuratè dicta sunt, quæ quisque sicut voluerit interpretetur ad sensum suum. Talia enim rectè intelligi non possunt, nisi prius ea quæ apertissimè dicta sunt, firma fide teneantur.*

[d] *Genes. 3. 16.*

[e] *Chrys. in Genes. hom. 18. Ne putes licèt tuum aduersatus sim sacrificium ob prauam mentem, fratrisq; oblationem accepi habuerim ob sanã intentionem, quod ideo primatu te destituã, & primogenituræ dignitatẽ à te auferam. Nam licet honore ego illũ prosecutus fuerim, acceptaque fuerint illius dona, verum amẽ ad te conuersio illius, et ipsius dominaberis. Atq; post peccatum hoc permitto, vt primogenituræ priuilegijs gaudeas, illumque sub tua potestate & dominio esse iubeo.*

der

*der thy power and rule.* Against this exposition *M. Bishop* glueth an exception, *that there is no mention of Abel, neither in that verse, nor in the verse next before; but expresse mention is made of sinne in the next words before: therefore those pronounes (that are to bee referred to the next words before) must needs be referred to sinne, and not to his brother.* But if his skill had serued him to consider, that the Hebrew word there for [f] *sinne* is in the *feminine gender*; and the pronoune relatiues in the [g] *masculine gender*, hee would haue learned thereby to except against this exception, and rather say, that the pronoune relatiues must needes bee referred to his brother, and not to *sinne*. And so the Greeke Translators did take it, [h] *the turning of H I M shall bee to thee, &c.* So doth *Arias Montanus* translate it, being himselfe a Papist, yet that way incomparably more faithfull then commonly Papists are, *The desire of H I M shall bee to thee*, that is, in thy power, *and thou shalt haue rule ouer H I M.* Another exception he taketh from *S. Austins* exposition of those words, who not acquainted with the Greeke and Hebrew Text, and finding in the Latine the pronounes *eius* and *illius* indifferent to the masculine or feminine gender, not thinking it fit in such meaning as hee conceiued thereof, to attribute to *Cain* a dominion ouer his brother *Abel*, construeth the place as touching *sinne*, and deliuereth two interpretations thereof, but no way according to *M. Bishops* meaning, nor any way fit to serue his turne: the more leadly doth hee deale, to make *S. Austin* the patron of an opinion, which as appeareth in all this discourse, he did so highly and inwardly detest. One exposition of his is in the reading of the words thus: [i] *Ad te conuersio eius sit: let the conuerting or turning of it bee to thee, and thou shalt rule ouer it:* as willing him to turne *his sinne* vpon *himselfe*, to accuse himselfe thereof, *to know that hee was not to attribute his sinne to any other but himselfe, and therefore not to defend it, but to repent and to aske pardon of it, and that this was the way to subdue it, and to become master of it.* Thus God left him not, as hee saith, *without a commandement iust and holy and good*, but in him glueth example, as was before said, how the commandement auaileth nothing from the mouth of God himselfe, where hee himselfe worketh not within, that which hee commandeth. To this agreeth in effect the exposition of *Ambrose*, though taking the words by way of accusation, which *Austin* construeth by way of precept or exhortation.

f *Vxori sinae.*

g *Virum* the desire of him, or his desire, and *ei* ouer him.

h Ἡ ἀποστροφὴ αὐτου.

i *August. de ciuit. Dei, lib. 5. cap. 7. Potest ita intelligi ad hominem conuersionem esse debere peccati, vt nullis alijs sciat quàm sibi tribuere debere quod peccat, &c. Tunc enim dominabitur quisque peccato, si id sibi non defendendo praesumpserit, sed poenitendo subiecerit, &c.*

k *Ambr. de Cain & Abelli, 2. ca. 7. In te reuertitur crimen quod à te capit. Non habes in quo necessitati magis quàm mentem tuam arguas. In te retorquetur improbitas tua, tu princeps illius es: Bene ait, Tu princeps es illius. Etenim impietas mater quædam est delictorum, &c.*

l *Aug. vt supra. Cum commota fuerit pars ipsa carnalis ad aliquid perperam committendum, si acquiescatur, Apostolo dicenti, Ne exhibeatis membra, &c. ad mentem domita & victa conuertitur vt subdita ratio dominetur.*

k *The sinne, saith God, returneth vpon thee which began of thee. Thou hast not wherein to blame necessitie more then thine owne minde. Thy wickednesse is turned backe vpon thee; thou art the beginner of it. Rightly doth hee say, thou art the beginner of it; for impietie is a mother of sinnes, &c.* Thus hee maketh God in those words to accuse *Cain* of sinne, not to attribute to *Cain Free will* for conuerting vnto God. The other exposition of *Austin* is in reading the place, l *Ad te conuersio eius erit, &c. The conuerting or turning thereof shall be to thee, and thou shalt rule ouer it,* vnderstanding *sinne* to be meant of *carnall concupiscence or lust*, and making the construction thus, that *when carnal concupiscence is moued or stirred to commit any wicked thing, if a man rest and harken to the Apostle, saying, Let not sin reign in your mortall bodies; giue not your members weapons of vnrighteousnesse vnto sinne, then it being tamed and ouercome, is conuerted and turned to be in subiection to the minde, that reason may haue the rule and dominion ouer it.* Therefore he taketh it, as if God had willed *Cain* to giue ouer that which by his owne wicked desire and lust he had intended, and if he did resist it, it should turne and yeeld to him, and whilest it was not suffered to worke without, it might bee the better accustomed not to stirre within. *Prosper* bringeth these latter expositions all into one, as if God had said to *Cain*, m *This is thy errour and thy sinne; be quiet, and be not moued against thy harmlesse brother; rather let thy sinne be charged vpon thy selfe: yeeld not to it that it should reign in thee, but do thou take on thee the dominion & rule ouer it. By repenting, thou shalt not goe to any further wickednes, & thou shalt be reformed in that wherein thou shalt grieue that thou hast offended me.* Thus heere is counsell and commandement to *Cain*, but no assertion of *Free will*; and by *Cains* going forward in his wicked course, wee see that *Free will* auaileth nothing to true obedience, and keeping of Gods commandement. Now then that *M. Bishop* can finde nothing in *Austin*, let vs see what *Hierome* hath to iustifie *Cains* example to be the maintenance of *Free will*. *Hierome* hath indeede the words and exposition which hee alleggeth: n *Because thou hast Free will, I admonish and warne thee, that sinne do not ouer-rule thee, but that thou ouer-rule sinne.* But that this neither helpeth him, nor hurteth vs, it will easily and plainly appeare, if wee consider what was accorded before betwixt him and vs. For wee denie not *Free will* in morall and ciuill outward actions, as hath beene

m *Prosper. de vocat. gent. li. 1. ca. 2. Iuxta hic error est, tuumq; peccatum. Quiesce, et noli in innocentem fratrem mouere: ad te potius tua culpa reuocetur. Noli peccato regnum in te dare, sed tu potius in ipsum iure dominatum. Pœnitendo enim nec in malis facinus progredieris, & ab eo in quo te doles displicuisse mundaberis.*

n *Hieron. tradit. Hebræ. in Genes. Quia liberi arbitrij es, iniungo vt non tibi peccatum, sed tu peccato dominaris.*

beene before acknowledged by him. For in vaine were education and lawes, and exhortations, and all precepts and directions of life, if there were not left in man a power to conforme himselfe outwardly to the prescriptions thereof. God hath left in nature *some outwardmost lineaments*, some vnperfect shadowes and portraiture of his image, for the preseruing of publike order and societie amongst men, which could not stand, if men for feare or shame, or other respects, could not containe and bridle themselues from those mischiefes and villanies, whereto corruption of nature doth incline them. To this the words of *Hierome* are to bee referred. For *Cain* was[p] now contriuing and plotting the murder of his brother. There was now no law to terrifie him from the accomplishing of that which he had intended, but God himselfe taketh vpon him to set before him the horrour of his fact, and to reclaime him from proceeding any further. If therfore we doe with *Hierome* referre the words heere questioned, to sinne, God speaketh to *Cain* to this effect: Why art thou so much offended that thy brother is better accepted then thy selfe? Why art thou thus mooued with enuie towards him, and intendest mischiefe against him? If thou doest well as he doth, assure thy selfe thou shalt be accepted as well as he. But if thou doe wickedly, if thou goe forward with that horrible villanie that thou hast conceiued, know for a suretie, that thy sinne shall lie waiting for thee at the doore, and shall neuer cease to attend and follow thee, till it haue brought vpon thee iust reuenge. Wherefore I aduise thee to giue ouer, bridle thy passion, be master thus farre of thine owne affections; let not enuie carrie thee forward to commit so monstrous and vnnaturall a fact: it is yet in thine owne power, and therefore stay thy selfe, and giue no further way to this bloudy designement, to be sorrie when it is too late. Thus much, and no more, doe *Hieromes* words expresse vnto vs, and wee doubt not but *Cain* had *Free will* as touching committing of this cruell act. For if some man had stood in his way with a sword drawne, to slay him if hee should attempt the killing of his brother, who doubteth but that it would haue made him hold his hands? which hee could not, if hee had not had in him power and libertie to forbeare. And if *M. Bishop* meant no more when hee speaketh of *Cains power not to sinne, if hee had listed*, we would acknowledge the same with him: but he would hereby prooue a *Free*

[o] *Aug. de spir. & lit. cap. 28. Non vsquaedeo in anima humana imago Dei detrita est, vt nulla in ea velut lineamenta extrema remanserint.*

*Origen. contr. Celsum. l. 4. Impossibile vt eius imaginis lineamenta omnino deleantur, &c.*

[p] *Chrysost. in Gen. hom. 18. Scibat ab initio quòd fratrem hic adoriturus esset, & ideo ante ea verbis reprimit.*

*will to good*, whereto hee ſaith, *Cain had the aſſiſtance of Gods grace, which yet did not infallibly draw him to good, but left him to his free choice, whether he would follow it or not.* For proofe whereof there is no ſhew of any ſyllable, either in the text, or in the other teſtimonies which he hath alleged. For as touching *grace*, wee finde heere none but that which the Pelagians ſpake of, to counſell and aduiſe him, whereas the true grace inwardly worketh whatſoeuer outwardly is counſelled or aduiſed. And whereas he ſaith, that *grace doth not infallibly draw to good*, it is true indeede of his Pelagian grace, which conſiſteth onely in the *commandement*; but the true grace of God doth *infallibly draw to good*. [q] *No man*, ſaith our Sauior Chriſt, *can come vnto me*, [r] *that is to ſay, beleeue in me, except my Father which hath ſent me draw him*: therby importing, that all that are drawne of the Father do come vnto him, that is, do beleeue in him, becauſe [s] *to be drawne of the Father vnto Chriſt, is to receiue a gift of the Father whereby to beleeue in Chriſt*; ſo that [t] *they which beleeue not are not drawne at all.* Therefore our Sauiour addeth in the next words; *Euery one that heareth and learneth of the Father*, that is, euerie one that the Father draweth, *commeth vnto me.* Now *M. Biſhops* drawing *leaueth a man at his free choice whether hee will follow or not.* He ſaith as the Pelagians did, [u] *If he will, he doth ſo; if he will not, hee doth not*: or as the Donatiſts, [x] *If he will, he beleeueth; if he liſt not, he beleeueth not: if hee will, he perſeuereth; if he will not, he perſeuereth not.* Theſe were the progenitors and predeceſſors of his faith. But the true *drawing grace*, finding a man [y] *reſiſting, drawing backe, vnwilling, perſecuting* the faith as *Paul* did, [z] *conuerteth his will to the faith; of vnwilling, it maketh him willing; of reſiſting, it maketh him conſenting; of an oppugner of the faith, it maketh him a louer thereof.* Let *M. Biſhop* acknowledge thi› *grace*, if hee will ſpeake of *grace* as the Scripture ſpeaketh: this is the onely true grace; and this grace *Cain* was neuer partaker of, and therefore being left to his owne will, hee did not what hee might haue done, in giuing eare to the warning and aduice that was giuen him of God.

q Joh. 6. 44.
r *Aug. contr duas epiſt. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 19. Venire ad me intelligitur credere in me.*
s *De prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 8. Nihil eſt aliud quàm donũ accipere à patre, quo credat in Chriſtum.*
t *Proſper. de vocat. gent. li. 2. ca. 9. Qui non credunt, nec trahuntur omnino.*
u *Aug. epiſt. 107. Libertate naturali ſi vult, facit: ſi nonvult, non facit.* Verſe 45.
x *Idem de vnit. Eccleſ. cap. 9. Cum arbitrio libero homo creatus eſt, & ſi vult, credit in Chriſtum: ſi non vult, non credit.*
y *Hieron. aduerſ. Pelag. lib. 3. Quis trahitur, non ſponte currit, ſed aut retrectans & tardus, aut inuitus adducitur.*
z *Aug. cont. duas epiſt. Pelag. li. 1. c. 19 Quis trahitur ſi iam volebat? Et tamen nemo venit niſi velit. Trahitur ergo miris modis vt velit ab illo qui nouit intus in ipſis hominum cordibus operari, non vt homines quod fieri non poteſt volentes credant, ſed vt volentes ex nolentibus fiant. Et lib. 4. cap. 9. Ex repugnantibus conſentientes, ex oppugnantibus amantes.*

## II. W. BISHOP.

The ſecond *is taken out of this text of Deut.* I call this day (*ſaith Moſes*) heauen and earth to witneſſe, that I haue ſet before you, life, and death, benediction, and malediction, therefore chuſe life, that thou maiſt liue and thy ſeed. *Which words were ſpoken in vaine, if it had not beene in their power, by the grace of God, to haue made choiſe of life: or if that grace would haue made them doe it infallible, without their conſent.* Cap. 30. 19.

## R. ABBOT.

*Moſes* ſaith,[a] *I haue ſet before you life and death, &c. Therefore chuſe life that thou maiſt liue. Theſe words,* ſaith *M. Biſhop, were ſpoken in vaine, if it had not beene in their power by the grace of God, to haue made choice of life.* Where hee ſtill goeth on with his Pelagian deuice, yeelding no more to *grace*, but onelie *adiuuare poſſibilitatem, to helpe the power of man*, that whereas the power of man is not ſufficient, it may by grace bee made able to *make choice of life*, but yet ſo, as that ſtill it reſteth in the will, whether to make vſe of this power or not. But by the true *grace* of God, man not onely *hath power to chuſe*, but indeed *doth chuſe the way of life.* And although man haue no power in himſelfe whereof hee can make vſe to make this choice, yet the words of God are not therefore ſpoken in vaine, becauſe the word & the preaching therof is the inſtrument whereby God worketh in man to *chuſe life*, whileſt through the ſpirit it taketh effect [b] *according to the purpoſe and grace of God.* Hee ſaith by the miniſterie of the word, *chuſe life*, and by his grace [c] *openeth the heart to attend to* that which he ſaith, and in the meane while [d] *giueth repentance*, [e] *giueth faith*, [f] *giueth the ſpirite of wiſedome and reuelation*, [g] *giueth to knowe the myſteries of the kingdome of heauen*, [h] *giueth a new heart*, [i] *giueth the feare of God*, and all things wherein conſiſteth *the choice of life.* He ſaith, *chuſe life*, but ſo, as that hee telleth vs alſo, [k] *Ye haue not choſen me, but I haue choſen you*, as if hee ſhould ſay, that it is not by our *Free will*, but by his chuſing of vs that wee make choice of him. [l] *It is of God*, ſaith *Proſper, that man maketh choice of the way of God, and ariſeth from his fall; and againſt all election or choice proceeding of Free will inuincibly reſiſteth the ſen-*

a Deut. 30. 19.

b 2. Tim. 1. 9.
c Act. 16. 14.
d 2. Tim. 2. 25.
e Phil. 1. 29.
f Ephe. 1. 17.
g Mat. 13. 11.
h Ezech. 36. 26.
i Jerem. 32. 40.
k Joh. 5. 16
l *Proſper. de vocat. gent. lib. 1. ca. 9. Ex Deo eſt vt homo vitam Dei elegat & ſurgat à lapſu &c. Et poſt. Contra omnẽ electionem de libero arbitrio venientem inuictiſſimè illa reniſitur ſententia dicentis Apoſtoli: Quis et diſcernit, &c.*

tence of the Apoſtle, ſaying, *Who ſeparateth thee? what haſt thou that thou haſt not receiued?* *M. Biſhop* ſaith, *My Free will, my choice hath made difference* betwixt mee and another man; becauſe when God made offer of life to vs both alike, I by *Free will* made choice thereof, and hee refuſed. But the Apoſtle telleth him, no. If hee haue made choice of life, it is no worke of *Free will*, it is a thing receiued. [m] *Of whom*, ſaith S. *Auſtin, but of him who hath not giuen to another that which he hath giuen vnto thee? Who*, as hee alſo anſwereth the Pelagian heretike obiecting the ſame place, [n] *inſpireth the loue whereby we chuſe.* He addeth further, that vainely it ſhould bee ſaid, *Chuſe life, if grace would haue made them doe it infallible without their conſent.* Where wee may wonder at his abſurde manner of ſpeech. Who was euer ſo madde, as to ſay that God maketh a man to chuſe life *without his conſent*, which is the ſame as if hee ſhould ſay, that hee ſhould make him conſent without conſent, for how ſhould chuſing be without conſenting? Wee deny not *conſent*, but we ſay with *S. Auſtine*, [o] *It is God who by his ſecret calling worketh the mind of man to giue conſent.* We ſay with *S. Bernard*, [p] *Conſent is not of man himſelfe, but God maketh a man willing, that is, conſenting vnto his will.* [q] *It is his deſire of thee, that cauſeth thy deſire of him, and that thou art forward to receiue his word, it commeth of his forwardneſſe and haſting to enter into thee.*

m *Au. de prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 5. A quo niſi ab illo qui te diſcernit ab alio tui non donauit quod donauit tibi?*

n *Idem. de perfect. iuſtit. prope finem. Inſpirat eligendi charitatem.*

o *Aug. epiſt. 107. Vocati one illa alta atq; ſecreta ſic eius agit ſenſui vt eidem legi atq; doctrinæ accómodet aſſenſui.*

p *Bernard. de gra. et lib. arbit. Non quod vel ipſe conſenſus ab ipſo ſit, & ipſe facit voluntatē, hoc eſt voluntati ſuæ conſentientē.*

q *In Cant. ſer. 57 Illius deſiderium tuum creat, & quod tu eius properas ſermonem admittere i nde eſt quod ipſe feſtinat i nire.*

## 12. W. Biſhop.

*Vnto theſe two places of the old Teſtament (one vnder the law of* Nature, *and the other vnder* Moſes *law*) *let vs couple two more out of the new Teſtament.*

*The firſt may be thoſe kind words of our Sauiour vnto the Iewes:* Ieruſalem, Ieruſalem, &c. how often would I haue gathered together thy children, as the henne doth her chickens vnder her wings, and thou wouldeſt not? *Which do plainely demonſtrate, that there was no want, either of Gods helpe inwardly, or of Chriſts perſwaſion outwardly, for their conuerſion: and that the whole fault lay in their owne refuſing, and withſtanding Gods grace, as theſe words of Chriſts do plainely witneſſe,* And thou wouldeſt not.

Mat. 23.

## R. Abbot.

If *M. Biſhop* were put to the framing of an argument from this place,

place, and to bring in this conclusion, that *man hath Free will to conuert and turne to God*, I suppose it would trouble him verie sore. The words do rather import, that howsoeuer Christ himselfe be amongst vs and speake vnto vs, yet our *Free will* auaileth nothing to make vs to hearken to him, but wee still refuse and rebell, vntill God do worke it in vs to obey and to hearken to his call. And thus *Moses* to giue a reason why the people of Israel profited not by the sight of so manifold signes and wonders, which the Lord had done before them and for them, saith, [a] *The Lord hath not giuen you an heart to perceiue, and eies to see, and eares to heare vnto this day.* [a] Deut. 29.4. Christ speaketh those words out of his humane affection; hee sheweth his loue towards them as man, hee signifieth his paines and labour bestowed amongst them, and what occasion hee had to complaine, as *Esay* had foretold, [b] *I haue laboured in vaine, I haue spent my strength in vaine & for nothing.* [b] Esai. 49.4. The words do no more import *Free will* then all other places of Scripture, that doe declare and set forth the rebellion of mans nature against God. But yet *M. Bishop* telleth vs, that hereby it is signified that God vsed all meanes that concerned him for the sauing of them, and they by their *Free will* crossed his purpose heerein. *The words*, saith he, *do plainly demonstrate that there was no want either of Gods helpe inwardly, or of Christs perswasion outwardly, for their conuersion.* But they doe not demonstrate so much, yea by diuers places of the Gospell wee see they are verie farre from that demonstration. For if there *wanted no inward helpe for their conuersion*, how was it said by our Sauiour Christ, [c] *Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent of the world:* [d] *To them it is not giuen to know the secrets of the kingdome of heauen:* [e] *all things are to them in parables, that they seeing may see and not discerne, and they hearing may heare and not vnderstand, least at any time they should turne, and their sinnes should bee forgiuen them?* How was it said by the Euangelist *S. Iohn*: [f] *Therefore could they not beleeue, because Esay saith againe: Hee hath blinded their eies and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eies, nor vnderstand with their heart, and should bee conuerted and I should heale them?* How doth *S. Paul* say; [g] *The election hath obtained, but the rest haue beene hardened, according as it is written, God hath giuen them the spirite of slumber, eies that they should not see. &c.* These things beeing so apparant and plaine, how doth *M. Bishop* tell vs

[c] Mat. 11.25.
[d] Cap. 13.11.
[e] Mar. 4.11.12.
[f] Ioh. 12.39.
[g] Rom 11.7.

that there wanted no helpe of God inwardlie for their conuerſion, but the want was onelie in their owne *Free will*? Surelie [h] *where God is willing to ſaue*, as S. *Auſtin* ſaith, *there no will of man reſiſteth. For to will or to nill, is ſo in the power of him that willeth or nilleth, as that it neither hindereth the will of God, nor ouerruleth his power, becauſe euen of the wils of men he maketh what hee will.* [i] *In no wiſe may wee thinke*, ſaith hee, *that the Almightie God would haue any thing to come to paſſe, and that the ſame doth not come to paſſe; who if hee doe whatſoeuer he will both in heauen and earth, as the truth inſtructeth vs, ſurely had no wil to do whatſoeuer he hath not done.* If therfore God had willed the conuerſion of the people of Ieruſalem, and had inwardly yeelded them grace for their conuerſion, it had followed infallibly that they had beene conuerted, neither ſhould the frowardneſſe of their will haue defeated the purpoſe of his will. [k] *My counſell ſhall ſtand*, ſaith hee, *and I will doe whatſoeuer I will*: therefore of *the children of Ieruſalem*, whomſoeuer God would gather, hee certainly did gather. His will was to gather [l] *a remnant according to the election of grace*. Ieruſalem *would not*, but reſiſted the will of God, and hindered ſo much as in it lay, *the gathering of this remnant of her children*. [m] But *though Ieruſalem would not, yet God gathered whom hee would*, and to them hee yeelded his infallible ſauing grace, whereby he *worketh to will and to do*, and giueth the gifts before mentioned of repentance, faith, knowledge, and ſuch like, without which there is no conuerſion, and the giuing whereof is our conuerſion vnto God. Which ſeeing God gaue not to Ieruſalem, ſaue onelie to his *remnant*, it is abſurdly ſaid by *M. Biſhop* that *there was no want of Gods helpe inwardly for their conuerſion*. Their refuſing and withſtanding was the fruite of *Free will*, which howſoeuer God do otherwiſe offer grace, hath nothing in it ſelfe, whereof to doe otherwiſe.

h *Aug. de corrept. & grat. cap. 14. Cui volenti ſaluũ facere nullum hominum reſiſtit arbitrium. ſic enim velle & nolle in volentis aut nolentis eſt poteſtate vt diuinã voluntatem non impediat nec ſuperet poteſtatem. De his enim quæ faciunt quæ non vult facit ipſe quæ vult, &c. De ipſis voluntatibus hominum quod vult fiet.*

i *Enchirid. ad Laurent. ca. 103. Dum tamen credere non cogamur aliquid omnipotentem Deum voluiſſe fieri quod non eſſe quis ſine vllo ambiguitatibus ſi in cœlo & in terra quæcunque voluit fecit, profectò facere noluit quodcunque non fecit.*

k Eſa. 46. 10.

l Rom. 11. 5.

m *Aug. Enchirid. cap 97. Vbi eſt illa omnipotentia &c. ſi colligere filios Hieruſalem voluit & non fecit? An potius & illa quidem filios ſuos ab ipſo colligi noluit ſed ea quoque nolentes filios eius collegit ipſe qui voluit, quia in cielo & in terra non quædam voluit & fecit, quædam vero voluit & non fecit, ſed omnia quæcunque voluit fecit.*

## 13. W. Biſhop.

The laſt teſtimonie *is in the Reuel. where it is ſaid in the perſon of God*: I ſtand at the doore and knock, if any man ſhall heare my voice and open the gates, I will enter into him, and will ſup with him, and he with me. *Mark well the words: God by his grace, knock-*

Cap. 3.

as

*at the doore of our hearts, he doth not breake it open, or in any sort force it, but attendeth that by our assenting to his cal, we open him the gates, and then to, he with his heauenly gifts will enter in: otherwise he leaues vs What can be more euident in confirmation of the freedome of mans will, in working with Gods grace?*

R. ABBOT.

Here *M. Bishop* doth somewhat plainly shew himselfe, and assureth vs that it is not without cause that wee haue hitherto accused him of the Pelagian heresie. The grace which for fashion sake hee speaketh of, is no other but such as whereby God knocketh at the doore of our hearts, but worketh nothing in our hearts, till we first of our selues assent to let him in. He attendeth till we open him the gates, and *then he with his heauenly gifts will enter in*; which was the damnable errour of the Pelagians, that *Gods grace and gifts are bestowed vpon the precedence of our will and workes*. But wee haue heard before out of the Arausicane Councell, that [a] *if any man say that God expecteth or attendeth our will, and doth not confesse that God worketh in vs to will, hee gainsaith the doctrine of the Apostle.* Which is the same as to say, if any man say that God attendeth for our opening the gates vnto him, and doth not confesse that God himselfe openeth the gates vnto himselfe, hee is contrarie to the doctrine of the Apostle. [b] *The entrance of Gods calling is wrought or procured by the grace of God himselfe*; he knocketh with one hand & openeth with another, [c] *breaking the gates of brasse, and smiting the barres of iron in sunder*, and howsoeuer mightily he knocke, we neuer heare, we neuer open till he open and make entrance for himselfe. It is hee that [d] *openeth the heart, hee* [e] *openeth the vnderstanding, hee* [f] *openeth the eies, he openeth* [g] *the eares, hee openeth* [h] *the lips, hee openeth* [i] *the doore of faith*; and why then doth *M. Bishop* say, that hee *attendeth till wee open*? He doth not *attend our assenting to his call*, but [k] *by his calling which is according to his purpose he worketh in the harts of mē, that they heare not the Gospel in vaine, but do conuert, and turne, & receiue it not as the word of man, but as it is indeed the word of God*. And whereas he saith, that *God doth not breake open the doores*, it is not alwaies true. For God sometimes with great violence assaulteth the hart, & [l] *by terror & feare pulleth men out of the fire*, & as with a mightie hammer breaketh the pride, & rebellio of the wil, fighting & stirring against him, when

[a] *Arausican. Concil. 2. cap. 4 Supra sect. 8.*
[b] *Aug. cont. duas epist. Pelag. lib. 4. cap. 6. Adstus diuinæ vocationis ipsa Dei gratia procuratur.*
[c] Psal. 107. 16.
[d] Act. 16. 14.
[e] Luk. 24. 45.
[f] Psal. 119. 18.
[g] Iob. 33. 16.
[h] Psal. 50. 15.
[i] Act. 14. 27.
[k] *Aug. de prædest. sanct. cap. 19. Deus operatur in cordibus hominū vocatione illa secundum propositum, vt non inaniter audiant Euangelium, sed eo audito conuertantur & credant, excipientes non vt verbum hominum, sed sicut est verè verbum Dei.*
[l] Jud. ver. 23.

when men are in the height of their insolencie madly raging a-
gainst him, hee striketh them to the ground, as hee did the Apostle
[m] *S. Paul*, and by astonishment ouercommeth and subdueth them
vnto himselfe, thus, [n] *not leading them as vpon their precedent will,*
*but drawing them; not to beleeue against their wils which is vnpossible,*
*but of vnwilling to become willing.* In a word, when God knocketh,
[o] *the doore is opened in them onlie to whom it is giuen, but they to whom*
*it is not giuen are still aduerse*, and they neuer open: and therefore
*M. Bishop* saith amisse, that *God attendeth that we open him the gates,*
*or otherwise leaueth vs.* Neither doe the words alledged serue for
*confirmation of the freedome of mans will*, telling vs onely what must
be done that God may enter, but not importing, that wee doe it by
any power of *Free will.*

m Act. 9. 4.
n *Aug. contr. duas Epist. Pelag. li. 1. cap. 19. Non ait duxerit, vt illic aliquo modo intelligamus præcedere voluntatẽ. Quis trahitur, &c. vt supra sect. 10.*
o *Idem. de prædest. sanct. cap. 10. Ostium ergo apertum est in eu, quibus datum est, aduersarij autem multis ex eis quibus non est datũ.*

## 14. W. Bishop.

*To these expresse places taken out of Gods word, let vs ioine the testimony of those most auncient Fathers, against whose workes the Protestants can take no exception. The first shall be that excellent learned Martyr* Iustinus *in his Apologie, who vnto the Emperour* Antonine *speaketh thus:* Vnlesse man by Free will could flie from foule dishoneste deedes, and follow those that be faire and good; hee were without fault, as not beeing cause of such things as were done. But wee Christians teach, that mankind by free choice, and Free will, doth both do well and sinne.

*To him we will ioine that holy Bishop and valiant Martyr* Irenæus,
Lib. 4. cap. 72. *who of Free will writeth thus:* Not onely in workes, but in faith also, our Lord reserued liberty and freedome of will vnto man: *saying*, Be it done vnto thee according to thy faith.

*I will adde to that worthy company* S. Cyprian, *who vpon those*
Ioan. 6. *words of our Sauiour*, Will you also depart? *discourseth thus:* Our Lord
Lib. 1. Epist. 3. did not bitterly inueigh against them, which forsooke him, but rather vsed these gentle speeches to his Apostles, will you also goe your way: and why so? Marrie obseruing and keeping (*as this holy Father declareth*) that decree, by which man left vnto his libertie and put vnto his free choice, might deserue vnto himselfe, either damnation or saluation. *These three most auncient, and most skilfull in Christian religion, and so zealous of Christian truth, that they spent*

their

*their blood in confirmation of it, may ſuffice to certifie any indifferent reader, what was the iudgement of the auncient and moſt pure Church, concerning this article of Free will: ſpecially when the learnedſt of our Adverſaries confeſſe all Antiquity, (excepting onely* S. Auguſtine) *to haue beleeued and taught Free will. Heare the words of one for all.* Mathias Illiricus *in his large, long lying hiſtorie, hauing rehearſed touching Free will, the teſtimonies of* Iuſtine, Irenæus, *and others, ſaith,* In like maner *Clement* Patriarch of Alex. doth euery where teach Free wil, that it may appeare (*ſay theſe Lutherans*) not onely the Doctors of that age to haue beene in ſuch darkneſſe, but alſo that it did much increaſe in the ages following. *See the wilfull blindneſſe of hereſie.* Illyricus *confeſſing the beſt learned in the pureſt times of the Church, to haue taught Free will: yet had rather beleeue them to haue been blindly led, by the Apoſtles and their beſt Schollers who were their Maſters, then to eſpie and amend his owne error. Theſe principall pillars of Chriſts Church were in darkneſſe belike as Proteſtants muſt needes ſay: and that proud Perſian, and moſt wicked Heretick* Manes (*of whom the* Manichees *are named*) *who firſt denied Free will, began to broach the true light of the new Goſpell.*

Cent. 2. cap. 4. col. 59.

## R. Abbot.

*M. Biſhop* held it to bee the beſt courſe for him *clauum clauo pellere, to driue out one nasle with another*, not anſwering the places which *M. Perkins* alledged out of the Fathers, but onelie croſſing them with other places. Nay, hee ſo paſſed them ouer, as that fraudulentlie and falſly hee would make his Reader beleeue, that they made all for him. But marke I pray thee gentle Reader, when *M. Biſhop* driueth all to this, that when God hath done his worke for mans conuerſion, it is left to mans *free choice*, whether to will the ſame or not, doth it make for him, or is it not againſt him which *M. Perkins* citeth out of *Auſtin*, that [a] *man therefore willeth, becauſe God worketh in him to will*? Surelie if man *therefore will, becauſe God worketh in him to will*, then Gods worke doth not leaue man to the free choice of his owne will. When *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *there is in man a naturall faculties of Free will, which being ſtirred vp and fortified is able to do any act appertaining to ſaluation*, doth the ſame *S. Auſtin* agree with him when he affirmeth, [b] *that man loſt Free will to the loue*

[a] *Aug. de correp. & grat. cap. 12. Ideò ſic vo'unt, quia Deus operatur vt velint.*

[b] *Epiſt. 107. Liberum arbitrium ad diligendum Deum primi peccati gravitate perdidimus.*

loue of God by the greatneſſe of Adams ſinne? When hee attributeth mans conuerſion but onely *principally to grace*, and blameth vs for that wee attribute the *whole worke to grace*, doth *S. Bernard* agree with him, when hee ſaith, [c] *that it is wholy of grace that wee are new created, healed, ſaued?* By theſe it is eaſie to make application of the reſt; but we may looke for good anſwers at his hands hereafter, who in the beginning beeing ſo directlie oppugned, would ſeeke thus in a cloud to ſteale away. But if *M. Perkins* were able to ſay nothing againſt him, we muſt think hee is able to ſay for himſelfe exceeding much. Yet his firſt authority out of *Iuſtinus Martyr*, maketh nothing at all for him: for beeing written to an heathen Emperour, it toucheth onely morall and externall actions, in which we deny not but that God hath left ſome freedome and libertie to mans will, as before hath been declared. His verie [d] drift there, is to condemne the wicked fancies of Aſtrologers and Stoike Philoſophers, who did hang all vpon [e] deſtinies and conſtellations, and fatall neceſſitie, and thence ſought excuſe of their lewde and abominable actions. And if we will more largely extend the words, yet are they nothing for *M. Biſhops* turne. [f] *We Chriſtians*, ſaith he, *do affirme that by free choice, and Free will, mankind doth both doe well and ſinne.* And ſo much wee affirme alſo, that man by free choice and Free will doth well, for there [g] *is no vertue where a man hath no will to that hee doth:* but we ſay ſtill againſt *M Biſhop*, that this is not that *Free will* that he requireth: it is not a power of nature, but wholy the effect of grace: [h] *It is the grace of God whereby mans will is made free, both to eſchue euill and do good*; and they that teach any other Free will, they are [i] *not the defenders, but the puffers vp and break-neckes of Free will.* And no otherwiſe did *Iuſtine Martyr* conceiue thereof, as appeareth by theſe words in the ſame Apologie: [k] *In like ſort as God created vs when wee were not, ſo do wee thinke that hee vouchſafeth them of immortalitie and beeing with him, who willinglie make choice to do thoſe things that are pleaſing vnto him. But to haue beeing at the firſt, it was not of our ſelues. In like ſort then to chooſe and follow what is pleaſing to him by thoſe reaſonable powers which hee hath giuen vs, it is by his perſwading and mouing of vs to the faith.* In which words hee plainely confeſſeth, that Free will to righteouſneſſe is wholy the gift of grace, and no more of our ſelues, then it was at firſt to create our ſelues. The place of *Irenæus* auaileth him as little, who diſputing in like

[c] Bernard. de grat. & lib. arb. Totum ex gratia.
[d] Iuſtin. Martyr Apol. 2. Ne quis noſtra dicta ſic accipiat, quaſi Fati neceſſitatem aſſeramus, & quæ fiunt ideo fieri, quia prædicta ſint: explicabimus hoc quoque, &c.
[e] Aug contra duas Epiſt. Pelag. lib. 2. cap. 6. & in Pſa. 140 & de ciuit. Dei. lib. 5. cap. 1.
[f] Hominem libero arbitrio, liberaque voluntate & peccare & rectè agere docemus.
[g] Proſper de vocat. Gent. lib. 2. ca. 9. Virtus nolentium nulla eſt.
[h] Aug. Epi. 107. vt ſupra Sect. 1.
[i] Idem de grat. & lib. arb. c. cap 14. Non defenſores, ſed inflatores & præcipitatores liberi arbit.
[k] Iuſtin. vt ſupr. ὃν τρόπον τὸν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ὄντας ἐποίησεν, ἢ αὐτὸν ἀγαθὸν ὄντα τὸ ἐλεῖν τῶν καλῶν ἐφεσθαι καὶ ἀθανασίας καταξιοῦται, τὸ μὲν ἐν ἀρχὴν γενέσθαι, οὐκ ἐξ ἡμετέρου ἦν, τὸ δὲ ἐξακολουθοῦσι οὐκ εἶναι αὐτῷ καθυμεῖται: διὸ καὶ τοῦτο ἐνδιάθετον λογικῶν συνδέμενον, πείθει τὸ ἐν ἐπὶ πίστιν αὐτὸν ἡμᾶς.

like ſort againſt them that held, that men by an immutable neceſſitie of created nature, are ſome good and ſome euill, proueth, that good and euill conſiſt in election and will, and that this appeareth, *by that the Apoſtle, and before him our Sauiour Chriſt, did giue counſell to doe ſome things, and from ſome other things to abſtaine.* Afterwards he ſheweth, *that not in workes onely, but alſo in faith our Sauiour reſerued to man libertie and freedome of will*, meaning that it is [*] *not by any compelling violence* that a man either beleeueth or worketh, but [m] by condition of nature he is ſuch as may either beleeue, or not beleeue; and when he beleeueth, it is by his will that he beleeueth, and by a power of the will that he hath to beleeue: yet ſo, as that we muſt ſay with *S. Auſtine*, [*] *Sed ea poteſtas nulla eſt niſi à Deo detur; but that power is none, except it be giuen of God.* We may not take *Ireneus* to be ſo groſſe, as to thinke faith to be of our owne power, which the Scripture ſo plainely telleth vs, is [o] *the gift of God.* And as the places that he allegeth are farre from any ſuch purpoſe, [p] *According to thy faith be it vnto thee*: [q] *All things are poſſible to the beleeuer*; ſo hee himſelfe elſewhere out of the words of the Apoſtle, [r] *I know that in me, that is, in my fleſh, dwelleth no good thing*; plainely affirmeth, [s] *that the good which belongeth to our ſaluation, is not of our ſelues, but of God, and that the grace of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt is our deliuerer*, that is, the thing whereby we are made free. Therefore he praieth for the Heretikes, againſt whom he wrote, that [t] *they might not continue in the pit which they had digged, but might be conuerted to the Church, and that Chriſt might bee formed in them, and that they might know the only true God and Lord of all.* Whereby it appeareth, that he did not take repentance, and faith, and conuerſion to God, to be matters of our Free will and power, but the merciſull gifts of God, and therefore by praier to be begged at his hands. The place of *Cyprian* ſoundeth very harſhly, but yet being taken in that ſenſe wherein the Fathers commonly ſpake before the Pelagian hereſie, namely, to affirme againſt the Manichees an act of mans will both in good and euill, ſo that by his will and election it is that either hee is good or euill, it importeth nothing againſt vs, becauſe wee denie not the act and election of mans will, but onely teach, that this act and election of the will is nothing at all of it ſelfe, as touching righteouſneſſe, but only what it is by being corrected and rectified by the grace of God. Our Sauiour ſaith to his Diſciples, *Will*

[l] *Iren. li. 4. ca. 72. Si non in nobis eſſet facere hæc, aut non facere, quam cauſam habebat Apoſtolus, et multo prius ipſe Dominus conſilium dare?*

[*] *Non de violentia cogens.*

[m] *Aug. de Prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 5. Poſſe habere fidem ſicut poſſe habere charitatem naturæ eſt hominum; habere autem fidem ſicut habere charitatem gratiæ eſt fidelium. Vid. Proſp. de vocat. Gen. lib. 2. cap. 2.*

[n] *Aug. Retract. lib. 1. cap. 22.*

[o] *Ephes. 2. 8.*

[p] *Mat. 8. 13.*

[q] *Mar. 9. 23.*

[r] *Rom. 7. 18.*

[s] *Iren. lib 3. ca. 22. Significans quoniam non à nobis ſed à Deo eſt bonum ſalutis noſtræ. Et iterum: Miſer ego homo, &c. Deinde inſert liberatorem gratia Dei, &c.*

[t] *Ibid. c. 46. Nos precamur non perſeuerare eos in ſuea quam ipſi fecerunt, ſed ſegregari ab huiuſmodi matre, &c. & legitimè eos generari. conuerſos ad Eccleſiam Dei, & formari Chriſtum in eis, & agnoſcere eos fabricatorem huius vniuerſitatis, &c.*

ye also goe away? [u] He obserueth the law (saith *Cyprian*) whereby man left to his libertie, and put to his owne will, (not deserueth, as *M. Bishop* falsely translateth, but) *desireth to himselfe either death or saluation*: importing hereby, that man freely and by his owne will maketh choice to continue with Christ vnto saluation; but not affirming, that mans owne will is herein free of it selfe, or hath of it owne, whereby to make this choice. And that he was of farre other mind then so to thinke, appeareth by his owne words, [x] often cited by *Austin* against the Pelagians: [y] *Wee are to glorie of nothing* (namely as touching righteousnesse) *because therein nothing is our owne.* [z] *It is of God*, saith he, *all that we can doe: of him it is that we liue, of him it is that we haue any power.* But most direct to this purpose is it which hee noteth as touching the petition of the Lords praier, *Leade vs not into temptation*, that wee are thereby [a] *put in minde of our owne frailtie and weakenesse*, and that for perseuering and continuing with Christ *to the glorie of confessing him, and suffring for his sake, it is wholly to be ascribed vnto God, and wee are not to assume any thing proudly to our selues.* Whereof *S. Austin* collecteth (as before) against the Pelagian heresie, that [b] *Cyprian leaueth vs nothing wherein to glorie as our owne; that he sheweth, that not to depart from God, is no otherwise but giuen of God, in that he teacheth, that it is to be begged of God: for hee that is not led into temptation, doth not depart from God. This*, saith he, *is not in the strength of Free will as now it is. It was in man before his fall, but after the fall of man God would not haue it belong saue onely to his grace, that wee come vnto him; neither would he haue it belong saue onely to his grace, that we doe not depart from him.* Thus hee conceiued and obserued as touching *Cyprians* meaning out of *Cyprians* owne words, and bereaueth *M. Bishop* of *Cyprians* warrant for that, which he would father vpon him by some words obscurely vttered in another place. [c] *Cyprian that worthy Martyr saw well enough*, saith he, *that we liue most in safetie, when we ascribe all to God, and do not commit our selues partly to God, and partly to our selues.* By these three therefore *M. Bishop* hitherto hath gained nothing, but by *Cyprian*, whose words seeme to make most for him, he gaineth least of all. But now hee vrgeth the confession of some of our

[u] *Lib. 1. ep. 3. Seruans lege qua homo libertati suæ relictus, & in proprio arbitrio constitutus sibimet ipsi, vel mortem appetit, vel salutem.*

[x] *Aug. contra 2. Epist. Pelag. lib. 4. cap. 9. & de Præd. sanct. cap. 2. & de bono perseu. cap. 19. &c.*

[y] *Cypr. ad Quir. lib. 3 cap. 5. In nullo gloriandum quando nostrum nihil sit.*

[z] *Lib. 2. Epist. 2. Dei est, Dei est omne quod possumus: inde viuimus, inde pollemus.*

[a] *Cypria. in Orat. Dominic. Admonemur infirmitatis & imbecillitatis nostræ, dum sic rogamus ne quis se insolenter extollat, ne quis sibi superbè atque arroganter aliquid assumat, ne quis aut confessionis aut passionis gloriam suam jactet, &c. vt dum præcedit & submissa confessio, & datur totum Domino, quicquid supplicitèr petitur, ipsius pietate præstetur.*

[b] *August. de bono perseuer. cap. 67. Nihil nobis relinquit, in quo tanquam in nostro gloriemur. Sequidem & vt non discedamus à Deo non ostendit, dandum esse nisi a Deo, cùm poscendum ostendit à Deo. Qui enim non infertur in tentationem, non discedit à Deo. Non est hoc omnino in viribus Liberi arbitrij quales nunc sunt, fuerat in homine antequam caderet, &c. Post casum autem hominis non nisi ad gratiam suam Deus voluit pertinere, vt homo accedat ad eum, neque nisi ad gratiam suam pertinere voluit, vt homo non recedat ab eo.*

[c] *Ibid. cap. 6. Tutiores viuimus si totum Deo damus, non autem nos illi ex parte & nobis ex parte commisimus. Quod vidit iste venerabilis Martyr, &c.*

best

beſt learned, that *all Antiquitie (excepting onely S. Auſtin) beleeued and taught Free will.* To this purpoſe he allegeth a place out of the Centuries, which he calleth *a large long lying hiſtorie*; marry ſpeaking but by roate as children doe, or as the Clowne did of *Ariſtides*, who giuing his voice to the baniſhment of the ſame *Ariſtides*, and being asked of him vnknowne, [d] *whether he knew him againſt whom hee gaue his voice, anſwered, that hee knew him not, but it was trouble vnto him to heare him tearmed a iuſt man.* For ſo *M. Biſhop* knoweth not the Centuries, (alas poore man, what ſhould hee meddle with ſuch great bookes?) but hee hath heard that Proteſtants were the Authors thereof, and that is enough to warrant him to giue his voice againſt them. But his fellowes know, that they haue good cauſe to ſpeake well of the Authors of thoſe Centuries, becauſe by them they haue been able to ſay more for themſelues then euer they were before: ſo faithfully did thoſe men deale in the compiling of that ſtorie. Now they ſay indeed, as hee allegeth from his Author, *that Clement Alexandrinus doth euery where teach Free will, and that not onely the Doctors of that age were in ſuch darkneſſe, but alſo that it did much increaſe in the ages following.* Where taking the matter to be ſimply, as they ſay, and as *M. Biſhop* doth obiect, what doth he gaine more by that obiection, then the Pelagians did? [e] *who defended their obſtinacie by antiquitie, and affirmed, that none of all the Eccleſiaſtical Writers that were before, did ſo expound the Scriptures, as Auſtin did*, namely, againſt the *Free will* and merits of man: and *that examining the opinions of the more ancient Fathers, they were found to be in a manner all of one minde againſt him.* But this he tooke to be no ſufficient argument, but freely profeſſeth of his doctrine, [f] *I know that no man without error could diſpute againſt it.* He excuſeth the ancients that were before him; [g] *that before the hereſie of the Pelagians began, they had not any ſuch neede to deale much in that queſtion, and therefore what they thought of the grace of God, they touched but briefly and by the way, in ſome places of their workes, but ſtood more vpon thoſe things which they handled againſt other enemies of the Church.* Yet he ſaith, *that by their ſupplications and praiers it plainly appeared what grace doth, becauſe they would not haue asked of God thoſe things*

d *Plutarch. Apophteg.*

e *Proſper. Epiſt. ad Auguſt. Obſtinationem ſuam vetuſtate defendunt. A nullo vnquam Eccleſiaſticorum ita eſſe intellecta vt nunc ſentiuntur, affirmant.*

f *Auguſt. de bono perſeuer. c. 18. Hoc ſcio, neminem contra iſtam Praedeſtinationem, &c. niſi errando diſputare potuiſſe.*

g *De praedeſt. ſanc. ca. 4. Priuſquam iſta hareſis oriretur, non habuerūt neceſſitatē in hac difficili ad ſoluendum queſtione verſari, &c. vnde factum eſt, vt de gratia Dei quid ſentirent, breuiter quibuſdam ſcriptorum ſuorum locis & tranſeuntes attingerent, immorarentur verò in eis quæ aduerſus alios inimicos Eccleſiæ diſputabant, &c. frequentationibus aut orationibus ſimpliciter apparebat Dei gratia quid valeret. Non enim poſcerentur à Deo quæ præcepit fieri, niſi ab illo donaretur, vt fierent.*

which

which he hath commanded to be done, but that they held that the doing thereof is the gift of God: [h] that the Church would not haue prayed to God, as it alwaies did, to giue men repentance, faith, obedience, perseuerance, but that it beleeued, that God ſo hath our heart in his power, as that hee worketh in vs to will the good that wee cannot haue without our will. He further obſerueth, that [i] all hereſies haue brought their ſeuerall queſtions into the Church, by occaſion whereof, as touching thoſe points, the truth of Scripture was the more diligently defended, and that by occaſion of the Pelagian hereſie, the places of Scripture concerning Predeſtination and grace of God, were by his labour more plenifully and plainely defended then they were before. And to conclude, out of all Antiquitie before him, he bringeth only [k] foure or fiue teſtimonies out of *Cyprian*, *Ambroſe*, and *Gregorie Nazianzene*, whereby to iuſtifie what he taught. Now by this anſwer of *Auſtin* to the Pelagians, *M. Biſhop* and his fellowes muſt receiue their anſwer. If it were no preiudice to him, that the Fathers before him taught otherwiſe then he did, it is no preiudice to vs teaching the ſame that hee taught. Hee profeſſed himſelfe [l] *to bee free in the writings of any ſuch men, and that it was the Scripture only to which hee was bound, without refuſall to giue conſent:* why then doth *M Biſhop* ſeeke to bind vs in a matter wherein *S. Auſtin* refuſed to bee bound? *Proſper* being vrged by the Pelagians with a ſentence out of the booke of *the Paſtor*, reiected it [m] *as a teſtimonie of no authority*, albeit Antiquity had [n] ſo accounted of that booke, as that they had ioined it to the bookes of the new Teſtament, and did reade it publikely in their Churches: and doth *M. Biſhop* thinke it much, that wee reiect ſome few teſtimonies alleged by him of farre leſſe authoritie then that was? But yet *Auſtine* found in theſe few teſtimonies of the more ancient fathers, ſufficient to iuſtifie both for him and vs, "*that we haue nothing whereof to glorie as ours, which God hath not giuen vnto vs; that our heart and thoughts are not in our owne power, but Gods: that all is to be aſcribed vnto God, and that we muſt confeſſe, that we receiue all wholly of him, as touching our conuerſion to God, and continuing with him: that it is wholly the gift of grace, the gift of God, which of him we haue, and*

[h] *De bono perſeuer. cap. 23. Non oraret Eccleſia, vt daretur infideli ius fidei, niſi Deum crederet, & auerſas & aduerſas hominum ad ſe conuertere voluntates: nec oraret Eccleſia vt perſeueraret in fide Chriſti, niſi crederet Dominum ſic in poteſtate habere cor noſtrum, vt bonum quod non tenemus niſi propria voluntate, non tamen teneamus, niſi ipſe in nobis operetur & velle.*

[i] *Ibid. c. 20. Dicimus ſingulas quaſque hereſes in ciuiliſſe Eccleſie proprias quæſtiones: contra quas diligentius defenderetur Scriptura diuina, quàm ſi nulla talis neceſſitas cogeret. Quid autem coegit loca Scripturarum, quibus prædeſtinatio commendata eſt copioſius & enucliatius iſto noſtro labore diſcuti, niſi quod Pelagiani dicunt, &c.*

[k] *Ibid. cap. 19.*

[l] *De nat. & gra. cap. 61.*

[m] *Proſper. de lib. arbit. Nullius authoritatis teſtimonium de libello Paſtoris.*

[n] *Ruffin. in expoſit. Symbol. apud Cyprian. & Aug. de bono perſeuer. cap. 19. Iſti tales tantique Doctores dicentes non eſſe aliquid de quo tanquam de noſtro quod nobis Deus non dederit gloriemur, nec ipſum cor noſtrum & cogitationes noſtras in poteſtate noſtra eſſe, et totum dare Deo, atque ab ipſo nos accipere confitentes, vt permanſuri conuertamur ad eum, vt id quod bonum eſt, nobis quoq; videatur bonum, & quod velimus illud, vt honoremus Deum, & recipiamus Chriſtum: vt ex indutis efficiamur deuoti & religioſi, vt in ipſam Trinitatem credamus, & confiteamur etiam voce quod credimus, hæc vtique gratia Dei tribuunt, &c.*

not

*not of our ſelues to will that that is good: to receiue Chriſt, to beleeue in God, and by voice to confeſſe that which wee beleeue.* And ſurely how-ſoeuer thoſe more ancient Fathers ſpake obſcurely of *Free will*, and ſome of them queſtionleſſe meant amiſſe, yet for the moſt part their ſpeeches being applied, as I ſaid before, againſt heathen Aſtrologers, and wicked heretikes, excluding mans will wholly from being any cauſe either of good or euill, they ſpake worſe then they meant, and if wee will take their words with thoſe qualifications and conſtructions, wherewith *S. Auſtin* cleared ſome ſpeeches of his againſt the Manichees, as [p] before was ſhewed in the anſwer to *M. Biſhops* Epiſtle, they ſhall eaſily be reconciled to the truth. Therfore in them alſo that ſpeake moſt amiſſe, we find ſometimes a right and true acknowledgement of the grace of God. Who was a greater Patron of *Free will* then *Origen?* who yet notwithſtanding confeſſeth, [q] *that our will ſufficeth not for the hauing of a cleane heart, but that wee haue need of God to create the ſame in vs, and that therefore he that knoweth how to pray, ſaith, Create in mee a cleane heart, O God:* [r] *that the true knowledge of God by his mercie and grace is granted onely vnto them who are predeſtinate to liue worthie of him whom they know:* [s] *that whatſoeuer is in vs worthy our reioicing, is not our owne, but the gift of God.* Yea where he affirmeth, that *there is in euery ſoule a ſtrength of power and freedome of will, whereby it may doe euery thing that is good;* yet further to expreſſe his mind hee addeth, [t] *that this benefit of nature was cropped by meanes of ſinne, and was turned aſide to ſhame and laſciuiouſnes; but that the ſame being repaired by grace, and reſtored by the doctrine of the word of God, doth giue that ſweet ſauour which God the firſt Creator put into it, but the treſpaſſe of ſinne had taken away.* Where it appeareth plainly, that in ſpeaking of *Free will*, his purpoſe was to ſhew what mans will is by condition of creation, & to what it may be repaired by the grace of God, not what power it hath of it ſelfe in this ſtate of corruption, to open to God when hee knoc-keth, or to aſſent to God when he calleth. And thus *Clemens Alexandrinus* affirming *Free will* againſt the heretikes *Valentinus* and *Baſilides*, who thought that men by an eſſentiall ſtate of nature were ſome good, ſome euill, ſome faithfull, and ſome vnfaithfull, ſo as that the will of man is nothing at all either way, yet reſerueth due

[p] Sect. 6.

[q] *Orig. contr. Celſum. l. 7. Noſtrum propoſitum non eſt ſufficiens ad hoc, vt mundum cor habeamus, ſed Deo eſt opus qui tale nobis creet: idcirco qui ſcit precari, dicit, Cor mundum, &c.*

[r] *Ibid. Bonitate ac humanitate Dei, & diuina ipſius gratia conceditur cognitio Dei duntaxat his qui ad hoc prædeſtinati ſunt, vt cognito Deo digni viuant, &c.*

[s] *In Matt. cap. 13. Quod gloriatione dignum eſt, id noſtrum non eſt, ſed donum eſt Dei.*

[t] *In Cant. Hom. 4. Sed quia hoc naturæ bonum præuaricationis occaſione deceptum, vel ad ignominiam, vel ad laſciuiam ſuerat inflexum, vbi per gratiam reparatur, & per doctrinam verbi Dei reſtituitur, odorem reddit ſine dubio illum quem primus Conditor Deus indiderat, ſed peccati culpa ſubtraxerat.*

place to the grace of God, saying, [u] *Wee haue speciall need of Gods grace, and true doctrine, and of chaste & pure affection, and of the Fathers drawing vs to himselfe.* Where by affirming the *Fathers drawing vs to himselfe*, hee plainly excludeth the voluntarie opening and assenting, and yeelding of *Free will*, because (as before was shewed out of *Austin*) importeth that there is no will in vs, till God of vnwilling doe make vs willing. Let one speech of *Austine* serue to cleare all this matter. [x] *We must confesse* (saith hee) *that we haue Free will both to doe euill and to doe good.* This is the common assertion of the Authors whom *M. Bishop* opposeth against vs: but let vs take the words following withall, and by them expound the same assertion. *For euill-doing euery man is free from righteousnesse, and the seruant of sinne, (there hee hath already Free will) but in that that is good no man can be free, except hee be made free by him that saith, If the Sonne shall make you free, then are ye free indeed.* If any of them thought otherwise, they erred in that they thought: neither learned they so to thinke of the Apostles, or their best scholars, as *M. Bishop* idlely talketh, but either borrowed it of heathen Philosophers, or presumed it of themselues. And whatsoeuer they thought or meant, their manner of speaking was not Apostolike, neither learned they it by the word of God: and therefore those times were not the purest times, which had thus in phrase and speech varied from that [y] *character and forme of doctrine, whereto* the Church was first *deliuered.* And if *M. Bishop* will say, that they learned these things of the Apostles, then he must condemne Saint *Austine*, and the whole Catholike Church of that time in which *Austine* liued, for teaching otherwise then they taught: which if he will not doe, he must perforce acquit vs as well as him, and let the blame rest vpon them to whom it doth appertaine. Whom we account no further to bee *Pillars of Christs Church*, then they themselues continued built vpon the Gospell, which Christ hath made [z] *the pillar and fortresse of our faith:* neither doubt we to say of them that they were *in darknesse*, where the [a] *word of the law and testimony* did not giue them light. Now for conclusion, he vpbraideth vs againe with the heresie of the Manichees, onely to shew himselfe a perfect scholar of the Pelagian schoole. For so did the [b] Pelagians obiect to *Austine* and other Teachers of the Catholike Church, that they tooke part with the Manichees, and defended their heresie in the

[u] *Clem. Alexand. Strom. l. 1. Oportet mentem habere sanam, &c. ad quod maxime diuina opus habemus gratia, rectaque doctrina, castaque & munda animi affectione, & Patris ad ipsum attractione.*

[x] *August. de corrept. & grat. ca. 1. Liberum arbitrium & ad malum & ad bonum faciendum constituendum est nos habere: sed in malo faciendo liber est quisque iustitiæ, peccati autem seruus: in bono autem liber esse nullus potest, nisi fuerit liberatus ab eo qui dixit, Si vos filius &c.*

[y] Rom. 6. 17.

[z] *Iren. lib. 3. ca. 1. Euangelium nobis in Scripturis tradiderunt Apostoli columnam & fundamentum fidei nostræ futurum.*

[a] Esa. 8. 20.

[b] *Aug. cont. duas Epist. Pelag. lib. 3. cap. 9. Excogitauerunt Manichæorum detestabili nomine imperitos quos potuerint deterrere ne aduersus eorum dogmata peruersissima aures accommodent veritati.*

the denying of *Free will*. They called them *Manichees*, and of themselues ſaid, that *they dealt for the Catholike faith againſt the prophane opinion of the Manichees*, only to colour their owne hereſie and enmitie againſt the grace of God, by falſly vpbraiding their aduerſaries with another. But *S. Auſtin* anſwered them, [c] *The Manichees deny, that to man being made good, Free will became the beginning of euill: the Pelagians ſay, that man being become euill, hath a will ſufficiently free for the doing of the commandement of good. The Catholike Church condemneth them both, ſaying to the Manichees, God made man iuſt; and to the Pelagians; If the Sonne ſhall make you free, then are you free indeed.* Let *M. Biſhop* turne the name of the Pelagians into Papiſts, and take this anſwer to himſelfe. The Pelagians and Papiſts are not therefore to be approoued, becauſe they condemne the hereſie of the Manichees, but are therefore to bee deteſted, becauſe they haue ſet vp another hereſie of their owne. [e] *Two errours (ſaith S. Auſtine) may be contrarie one to the other, and both to be deteſted, becauſe they are both contrarie to the truth.* So is it with the Manichees and Papiſts: and wee take the courſe that the ancient Church did to condemne them both. But of this matter I haue ſpoken ſufficiently before in anſwering his Epiſtle, and therefore need not heere to ſtand vpon it.

[c] *Ibid. lib. 1. ca. 1. Pro Catholica fide contra Manichæos ſicut loquuntur profanitatem conſenſionem Orientalium Epiſcoporum videntur expoſcere, &c.*

[d] *Ibid. c. 2. Manichæi negant hominis bono ex libero arbitrio fuiſſe initium mali. Pelagiani dicunt etiam hominem malum ſufficienter habere liberum arbitrium ad faciendum præceptum bonum. Catholica vtroſque redarguit, &c.*

[e] *Ibid. poſſunt duo errores inter ſe eſſe contrarij, ſed ambo ſunt deteſtandi, quia ſunt ambo contrarij veritati.*

## 15. W. Biſhop.

*Here I would make an end of citing Authorities, were it not that* Caluin *ſaith, that albeit all other ancient Writers be againſt him, yet* Saint Auguſtine *as he vaunteth, is cleerely for him in this point: but the poore man is fouly deceiued as well in this, as in moſt other matters. I wil briefly proone, and that out of thoſe workes which* S. Auguſtine *wrote after the Pelagian hereſie was a foot: for in his others,* Caluin *acknowledgeth him to haue taught Free will. Of our Freedome in conſenting to Gods grace, he thus defineth:* To conſent to Gods calling, or not to conſent, lieth in a mans owne will. *Againe:* Who doth not ſee euery man to come, or not to come by Free will? but this Free will may be alone, if he do not come, but it cannot be holpen, if he doe come. *In another place,* that we will (do well) God wil haue it to be his and ours; his, in calling vs; ours, in following him. *Yea more:* To Chriſt working in him, a man doth cooperate, that is, worketh with him, both his owne iuſtification, and life euerlaſting. *Will you heare him ſpeake yet more formally for vs?* Wee haue dealt with your bre-

2. Inſt. ca. 2. q. 4.

De ſpir. & lit. 34. De gra. Chr. 14. Ad Simpli. qu. 2. Tract. 72. in Ioan. Epiſt. 47.

thren and ours, as much as we could; that they would hold out and continue in the ſound Catholike faith, the which neither denieth Free will, to euill or good life, nor doth attribute ſo much to it, that it is worth any thing without grace. *So according to this moſt worthie Fathers iudgement, the ſound Catholike faith doth not deny Free will, as the old* Manichees, *and our new Goſpellers doe; nor eſteeme it without grace able to doe any thing toward ſaluation, as the Pelagians did. And to conclude, heare* S. Auguſtines *anſwer vnto them, who ſay, that hee, when hee commendeth grace, denieth Free will:* Much leſſe would I ſay, that which thou lyingly doſt affirme me to ſay, Free will to be denied, if grace be commended; or grace to bee denied, if Free will be commended.

Lib. 4. contr. Jul. c. 8.

## R. Abbot.

*Calvin* indeed confeſſeth, as the truth is, that the [a] *ancient Writers, ſaue onely Auſtin, haue written ſo diuerſly and intricately, or obſcurely of Free wil, as that hardly a man can gather from them any certainty as touching that point.* But yet he ſaith further, that [b] *albeit they went too farre ſometimes in extolling Free will, yet hee dareth to affirme that they aimed at this marke, to turne man altogether away from the confidence of his owne ſtrength, and to teach him to make the repoſe of his ſtrength in God onely.* But whereas *Calvin* thinketh that *Auſtine is cleare for him in this point, M. Biſhop* ſaith, *the poore man was foulely deceiued as well in this, as in moſt other matters.* Where I cannot but ſmile to ſee how euery ignorant babler will haue a ſnatch at *Calvin*, when he in the meane time going like a ſtately Lion, ſhaketh them off like curres, and daſheth them againſt the walles. If *Calvin* were ſo poore a man, alas what ſhal we thinke of *M. Biſhop*? What ſhall we make of him but a begger outright? Yet hee taketh vpon him to *proue, and that out of thoſe workes which S. Auſtin wrote after the Pelagian hereſie was a foot, that the ſame Auſtin taught Free will.* And wee denie not, but that hee did ſo, and in that meaning wherein he taught it, we are ready to affirme it. Yea let him remember that *Calvin* profeſſeth, that [c] *if any man will vſe the name of Free will without the corrupt meaning of it, hee will not gaine ſay him; onely becauſe it cannot be retained without danger of euill vnderſtanding, he wiſheth it to be forborne,* and in that reſpect wee for the moſt part doe forbeare

[a] *Inſtitut. lib. 2. cap. 2. Sect. 4.*

[b] *Ibid. Sect. 9.*

[c] *Ibid. Sect. 8.*

forbeare it. But this *Free will* in true meaning, is *no faculty of nature*, as *M. Bishop* will needs haue it, but [d] *it belongeth to the grace of God, to the gifts of God, not onely the being of it, but the conuerting of it vnto God.* And verie truly doth the same *S. Austin* argue, that [e] *if we haue of God* (by nature) *a Free will, which may be either good or euill, and haue of our selues a good will* (by consenting or applying it when God calleth to that that is good) *then better is that that wee haue of our selues, then that that we haue of God.* Which because it is absurd, wee must needs acknowledge, that a good will, that is to say, *Free will* to faith and righteousnesse, is not of our selues, but of God onelie. But *M. Bishop* alledgeth *Austine* affirming, that [f] *to consent to Gods calling, or not to consent, propriæ voluntatis est, belongeth to mans owne will.* But rather he should say, *propriè voluntatis est*, that is, *it conserneth properly the will*: the place by changing of a letter being vndoubtedly corrupted, *S. Austins* purpose there, being onely to note the will to be the subiect, not the cause of this consenting. To consent hee meaneth is an act of the will, which howsoeuer God worketh in the will to doe, yet the will it is that doth it, but that the will consenteth by a power of it owne, he meaneth not: yea he himselfe plainly euicteth the contrarie in the words immediatly going before. For what is it to consent, but *velle credere, to bee willing to beleeue?* And [g] *God it is* (saith hee) *that worketh in vs to bee willing to beleeue.* Therefore it must needs bee, that God worketh in man to giue consent. Mans will consenteth, it is true: [h] *sed præparatur voluntas à Domino: but the will is framed or prepared of the Lord. Faith is in the power of man:* [i] *sed nulla est potestas nisi à Deo, but there is no power but of God.* It is in mans will, when God hath giuen him to will: it is in mans power, when God hath giuen him power. And more then this, howsoeuer wee read the words, *S. Austine* intended not. For full and certaine assurance whereof, *M. Bishop* should haue remembred, that *S. Austine* himselfe reporteth it as an error which hee had sometimes holden, [k] *that to consent to the Gospell when it is preached is of our owne will, and that wee haue that of our selues.* From which error hee professeth he was reclaimed by those words of the Apostle: [l] *What hast thou that thou hast not receiued?* For if it bee of our owne will that we consent, then somewhat we haue of our selues which we haue not receiued. Hee should further haue remembred, that *S. Austin* noteth it as the error of the Pelagians, that [m] *to consent, or*

[d] *Aug. de peccat. mer. & remiss. lib. 2. cap. 6. Ipsum liberum arbitrium ad gratiam Dei, hoc est, ad dona Dei pertinere nō ambiga, nec solum vt sit, sed etiam vt bonum sit, hoc est, ad facienda Domini mandata conuertatur.*

[e] *Ibid. cap. 18. Si nobis libera quædam vo'untas ex Deo est, quæ adhuc potest esse vel bona vel mala, bona verò voluntas ex nobis est, melius est id quod à nobis, quam quod ab illo est.*

[f] *De spirit. & lit. cap. 34.*

[g] *Ipsum velle credere Deus operatur in homine.*

[h] *Contra duas Epist. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 18. & lib. 2. cap. 8. & de prædest. sanct. cap. 5.*

[i] *De spir. & lit. cap. 31.*

[k] *De prædest. sanct. cap. 3. Vt prædicato nobis Euangelio consentiremus, nostrum esse, & nobis ex nobis esse arbitrabar. Quem meum errorem nonnulla opuscula mea satis indicant ante Epistolam istam meam scripta.*

[l] *1. Cor. 4. 7.*

[m] *Epist. 107. Consentire, vel non consentire, ita nostrum est, vt si velimus,*

*or not to consent is in our selues, and of our selues, so that if we will, wee do so: or if we will not, we cause that the worke of God nought auaileth in vs.* *M. Bishop* therefore doth amisse, to make *Austin* a patron of that opinion which he reformed as an error in himselfe, and condemned as an error in other men.

The second place that he alledgeth, in *Austins* true meaning is altogether against him. [n] *Who doth not see* (saith he) *that euery man cometh or cometh not arbitrio voluntatis, by his will?* (Let it be as *M. Bishop* saith, *by Free will:*) *But this will may be alone* (saith he) *if hee come not; but it cannot be but helped if he do come.* Where shewing that our coming or not comming to Christ is acted by our wil, he giueth to vnderstand, that our will is of it selfe free to refuse to come: but that the *Free will* whereby we doe come, is the gift of God, euen as our Sauiour Christ teacheth vs, saying: [o] *No man can come vnto mee, except it be giuen him of my Father.* And therefore the same *S. Austin* elsewhere reasoneth with a man in this sort: [p] *Thou sayest vnto mee, I am come to Christ by my Free will, I am come by mine owne wil. Why art thou proud of this? Wilt thou know that euen this also was giuen thee? Heare him that called thee: No man commeth vnto me except my Father draw him. For* [q] *when God will haue a man do that which is not to be done but by the will, he in an vnspeakable and wonderfull sort worketh in him to will.* But *M. Bishop* perhaps groundeth vpon that that S. *Austin* saith, that the wil of man is *helped* if he do come, as importing that man doth somwhat of himselfe, but yet is not fully sufficient without helpe. Whereto I answer againe, that man doth somwhat, but not of himselfe, & God helpeth man doing somwhat, but so, as that that wherein hee helpeth him is of God also, so that Gods helping of vs doth alwaies presuppose a worke of his owne in vs, which he alone and wholy doth without us. [r] *Without vs* (saith *Austine*) *he worketh in vs to will, and worketh with vs, or helpeth vs when we do will:* [s] *the will is changed from euill to good, and helped when it is good.* [t] *He prepareth the good will that is to bee helped, and helpeth it when it is prepared.* [u] *Free will to righteousnesse is first made free, and then helped.* Herein then standeth *M. Bishops* error, that hee ioineth man to God in the first framing of the will to come to God, so that for the performance hereof, as God is mans helper, so man is also Gods helper, not by that that God hath now wrought in man, but by that that man hath naturally of his owne: and there-

fore

[n] *Contra Pelag. & Celest. lib. 1. cap. 14. Quis non videat & venire quenquam & non venire arbitrio voluntatis? sed hoc arbitrium potest esse solum si non venit, non potest autem nisi adiutū esse si venit.*

[o] *Ioh. 6. 65.*

[p] *August. Quomodo veniisti? & Veni, in tuis, libero arbitrio voluntate propria veni. Quid tu respicis vu nosse, quod & hoc præstitum est tibi? Ipsam audi vocantē Nemo venit ad me &c.*

[q] *De Prædest. sanct. cap. 10. supra Sect. 6.*

[r] *De grat. & li. arbit. cap. 17. Vt velimus sine nobis operatur: cum autem volumus, nobiscum cooperatur.*

[s] *Ibid. cap. 20. Ex malè mutatur in bonam, & cùm bona fuerit adiuuatur.*

[t] *Enchir. cap. 32. Hominis voluntatem bonam & præparat ad iuuandam, & adiuuat præparatam.*

[u] *Contra duas Epist. Pelag. lib. 2. cap 8. Ad iustitiā nisi diuinitus liberatum adiutumque non valet.*

fore God helpeth man for his ſaluation, if man by his *Free will* help God for the ſauing of himſelfe: but if man withdraw his helpe, the helpe of God auaileth nothing. But the true helpe of God which *S. Auſtine* teacheth, is that whereby God himſelfe worketh in vs, that whereby we are helpefull vnto him, neither doth he helpe any thing in vs, but what hee himſelfe hath wrought and prepared in vs to be helped. And therefore hee maketh a diſtinction of two kindes of *helpe*. [x] *Aliud eſt adiutorium, ſine quo aliquid non fit, & aliud eſt adiutorium, quo aliquid fit. There is a kind of helpe, without which a thing is not done, and there is another kinde of helpe by which a thing is done.* There is a helpe without which a thing is not done, but though that helpe bee had, it followeth not thereupon that the thing is done, becauſe ſome other helpe is wanting, without which that helpe auaileth not. *Without foode wee cannot liue, and yet though food bee had, he liueth not thereby that will die*, or maketh away himſelfe. Such was the helpe of God to *Adam* in Paradiſe, [y] *without which he could not continue though he would, by which he might continue if he would*; but was left to his owne will, either to continue by this helpe, or by forgoing it to fall away. Such the Papiſts ſay the *helpe of God is* to vs, by which we come to Chriſt, and continue if we will: but both for comming and for continuing it is left to our *Free will*, either to vſe it, or refuſe it: ſo that it is in vs whether it ſhall be a helpe or not. But [z] *the helpe of the grace of Chriſt* is ſuch, as whereby the thing is certainely effected, for which it is *a helpe*; not ſuch as whereby wee come to Chriſt, or continue with him *if wee will*, but *which maketh vs to will*: ſo that it is firſt a meere *gift* of that, of which afterwards it becommeth a *helpe*. For example hereof Saint *Auſtine* ſaith, that [a] *bleſſednesse is a helpe by which when it is giuen, a man is foorthwith bleſſed.* Thereby giuing to vnderſtand, that this *helpe* is the giuing of the thing wherein God is ſaid to helpe vs. So that *Gods helpe* for our comming to Chriſt, is *the gift* of God wherby we doe come: his *helpe* for our beleeuing, is his very gift whereby wee doe beleeue: his [b] *helpe* for our perſeuering and continuing with Chriſt, is his gift, whereby wee doe perſeuere, *and no other but perſeuere* and continue to the end. And this *helpe* doth Saint *Auſtine* meane in the place cited by *M. Biſhop*. *The will cannot but bee holpen, if a man come to Chriſt*, meaning, that mans will cometh not to Chriſt,

[x] *De corrept. & grat. cap. 12.*
[y] *Ibid. cap. 11. Adiutorium per quod poſſet (ſi vellet) & ſine quo non poſſet perſeueranter bonum tenere quod vellet.*
[z] *Ibid. Eſt in nobis per hanc gratiam non ſolùm poſſe quod volumus, verumetiam velle quod poſſumus.*
[a] *Cap. 12. Beatitudo cùm data fuerit continuo fit beatus: adiutorium eſt enim non ſolum ſine quo nõ fit, verumetiam quo ſit propter quod datur.*
[b] *Ibid. ſanctũ tale adiutoriũ perſeuerantiæ datur, vt eis perſeuerantia ipſa donetur, non ſolùm vt ſine iſto dono perſeuerantes eſſe non poſſint, verumetiã vt per hoc donum nonniſi perſeuerantes ſint.*

except God giue vnto the will to will and to come, that is, to beleeue in him. And therefore he addeth, [c] *And so helped, as that hee not onely know what is to be done, but doe also that which hee knoweth:* which in the Chapter before hee hath thus expressed, that [d] *to them which are called of purpose, God at once giueth both to know what they should do, and to do what they know.* Gods helping therefore is no other but his *giuing:* and by this second place *M. Bishop* gaineth as little as he gained by the first.

As little aduantage hath he by the third place, nay, we see therein a notable peece of fraud and falshood in concealing the former part of the words, which should cleere the latter. [e] *In one sort,* saith *Austine, God yeeldeth to vs to will; in another sort hee performeth the thing that we will. That wee will, hee would haue it to be his and ours: his in calling; ours in following. But the thing that we will he alone performeth, that is, to bee able to doe well, and for euer to liue in blisse.* Where plainely he affirmeth, that it is God that doth or performeth both the one and the other; hee maketh vs to will, and hee maketh good to vs the thing that our will desireth. How then will hee haue it *to bee ours that we will or are willing,* but by his working it in vs to be ours? It is the act of our will when wee do will, and so *ours,* but yet it is Gods, because hee worketh in vs to will. It is *his in calling, ours in following;* but it is his also that we follow, because he maketh vs to follow. For how do we follow when he calleth, but [f] *by willing and beleeuing?* And no man can beleeue, [g] *except it bee giuen to him to beleeue,* and [h] *that there is a yeelding or assenting of the will, it is hee that giueth it,* saith *Austin* in that verie treatise, *it is he that granteth it;* so that although wee will, and wee runne, and this willing and running bee ours, yet as the Apostle saith; [i] *it is neither of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.* Concerning which words, it is worth the while to obserue what Saint *Austine* writeth in the same discourse, whence *M. Bishop* taketh this obiection, and within a verie few lines after, and thought worthy to remember in diuers places of his workes. *M. Bishop* saith as all his fellowes, that all is not of God, but somewhat belongeth to mans *Free will* for his conuersion vnto God, which yet sufficeth not vnlesse it bee helped by the grace of God. But *S. Austin* saith,

If

c Et sic adiutum vt non solum quid faciendum sit sciat, sed quod scierit etiam faciat.

d Cont. Pelag. & Celest lib 1.cap.13. Si docet eos Deus qui secundum propositum vocati sunt simul donans & quod agant scire, & quod sciunt agere.

e Ad Simplic.q.2. Aliter Deus præstat vt velimus, aliter præstat quod voluerimus: vt velimus & sum voluit esse nostrum: suum vocando, nostrum sequendo. Quod autem voluerimus solus præstat, id est, posse bene agere & semper beatè viuere.

f Prosper. de vocat gent. lib. 2. cap. 9. sequaces fide & voluntate.

g Aug. cont. duas epist. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 19.

h Ad Simplic. q. 2 Vt sit motus voluntatis ille tribuit, ille largitur.

i Rom. 9. 16.

*k If therefore onely it be said, It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercie, because the will of man alone is not sufficient, except it be helped by the mercy of God, it may be also thus said, that it is not of God that sheweth mercy, but of man that willeth, because the mercy of God alone sufficeth not, vnlesse there bee adioined the consent of the will of man.* More effectually doth hee expresse it in another place. *l If therefore it be said, It is not of him that willeth, or of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy, because it is done by both, that is, by the will of man, and by the mercy of God, as if it were said, the will of man alone sufficeth not, if there be not also the mercy of God, then also the mercy of God sufficeth not, if there be not also the will of man: and by this meanes, if it be rightly said, It is not of him that willeth, but of God that sheweth mercy, because the will of man alone auaileth not: why is it not on the contrarie rightly said, It is not of God that sheweth mercy, but of man that willeth, because the mercy of God alone auaileth not? Now if no Christian man will dare to say so, it remaineth that we vnderstand it therefore said, It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy, Vt totum Deo detur, that all wholy may bee attributed to God, who prepareth or maketh the good will of man.* What could be more notably spoken to ouerthrow all Popish assertion of mans *Free will*? which seeing *S. Austine* gaue *M. Bishop* occasion to note in the verie place whence hee tooke his obiection, wee must needs thinke him a man of a seared conscience, that would thus wilfully bend himselfe against an apparant truth. In a word, I answer his obiection out of *Austine* by the words of *Hierome*, hauing reference to the same sentence of the Apostle: *m To will, and to nill* (according to godlinesse) *is ours; but euen that that is ours, is not ours without the mercy of God.*

His fourth place of *Austine*, is that *n Christ working in man, man himselfe doth cooperate, that is, worketh together with him his owne iustification and life euerlasting.* An idle obiection, because by that verie place, if it were discussed, it should appeare which the same *S. Austine* for a full answer expressly saith elswhere, *o that God ma-*

k *Ad Simplic. q. 2. si propterea solum dictum est, Non volentis, quia voluntas hominis sola non sufficit vt iustè rectèque viuamus nisi adiuuemur misericordia Dei, potest & hoc modo dici, Igitur non misericordis est Dei sed volentis est hominis, quia misericordia Dei sola non sufficit nisi consensus nostræ voluntatis addatur. At illud manifestum est frustra nos velle nisi Deus misereatur. Illud autem vtrocio quomodo dicatur frustra Deum misereri nisi nos velimus.*

l *Enchirid. ca. 32. Si propterea dictum est, Non volentis, &c. quia ex vtroque fit, id est, ex voluntate hominis & misericordia Dei, vt sic dictum accipiamus, Non volentis, &c. tanquam diceretur non sufficit sola voluntas hominis si non sit etiam misericordia Dei, non sufficit ergo sola misericordia Dei si non sit etiam voluntas hominis: ac per hoc si rectè dictum est, Non volentis hominis sed miserentis est Dei quia id voluntas hominis sola non implet, cur non & è contrario rectè dicitur, Non miserentis est Dei sed volentis est hominis quia id misericordia Dei sola non implet? Porro si nullus Christianus dicere audebit, Non miserentis est Dei sed volentis est hominis ne Apostolo apertissimè contradicat, restat vt propterea rectè dictum intelligatur, Non volentis, &c. vt totum Deo detur qui hominis voluntatem bonam & præparat adiuuandam & adiuuat præparatam.*

m *Hieron. epist. ad Demetriad. Velle & nolle nostrum est, ipsumque quod nostrum est sine Dei misericordia nostrum non est.*

n *August. in Ioan. tract. 72. Operante in se Christo cooperatur saluti æternæ ac iustificationem suam.*

o *In Psal. 77 Dei gratia non solum operatur remissionem peccatorum, sed etiam cooperantem sibi facit spiritum hominis in opere bonorum factorum.*

keth

*keth the ſpirit of man to cooperate, or worke together with him in doing of good works*, ſo that this *cooperating, or working together with God*, attributeth nothing to the will of man, but what is the proper effect of the grace of God.

In the fifth teſtimony he ſaith, that *Auſtin ſpeaketh yet more formally for them*, but let him conceiue of the forme as he will, wee are ſure he is farre from the matter of S. *Auſtins* ſpeech. [p] *The ſound Catholike faith*, ſaith hee, *neither denieth Free will, whether to euill life or to good, neither attributeth ſo much to it, as that it auaileth any thing without grace, either to bee conuerted from euill to good, or by perſeuerance to go forward in that that is good, or to attaine to the euerlaſting good.* Now we whom *M. Biſhop* termeth *new goſpellers*, but yet out of the old Goſpell doe affirme, according to the true meaning of S. *Auſtin*, that there muſt be a *Freewill* either in euill or good life. For a man cannot be either good or euill againſt his will, and if hee be willingly that that hee is, it is by *Free will*, becauſe the *will* is alwaies *Free*, and cannot but be *Free* in that that it willeth. But the will of man is of it ſelfe *Free* in that that is euil; to that that is good, [q] *it is ſo farre onely Free, as it is made Free*; [r] *neither can any man in this reſpect bee free whome the purchaſer of freedome hath not made free.* Wee ſay therefore that the *Free vvill* of man *auaileth nothing without grace*, that is in S. *Auſtins* conſtruction, *auaileth nothing but by that that grace vvorketh in it*, either for conuerting vnto God, or perſeuering in that whereunto it is conuerted. And therefore as S. *Auſtin* in the epiſtle cited ſpeaketh, [f] *It is by grace that good men haue obtained a good will, and grace muſt be vnderſtood to make the wils of men of euill good, and to preſerue the ſame when it hath ſo made them; and of our Father which is in heauen wee are to begge all things whereby wee liue well, leaſt preſuming of Free vvill, vvee fall away from the grace of God.* If *all things*, then are we to begge of him to open, to yeeld, to aſſent, to receiue his grace, and therefore theſe things cannot be attributed to the power of our owne *Free will*. Now *M. Biſhop* meerely abuſeth *Auſtin*, as if he had meant, that *Free will* hath a power and abilitie of it owne to righteouſneſſe, but that this power is not ſufficient, is not ſtrong enough *without grace* adioyned to it, whereas S. *Auſtins* meaning is to chalenge wholy to grace, whatſoeuer the *will* of man doth, ſo that it doth nothing but what grace worketh

[p] Epiſt. 47. Catholica fides neque liberum arbitrium negat, ſiue in vitâ malam ſiue in bonam, neque tantùm ei tribuit vt ſine gratia Dei valeat aliquid, ſiue vt ex malo conuertatur in bonum, ſiue vt in bono perſeueranter proficiat, ſiue vt ad bonum ſempiternum perueniat.

[q] Retract. lib. 1. cap. 15. Intantum libera eſt in quantum liberata eſt.

[r] Con. duas epiſt. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 3. Et De corrept. & grat. cap. 2. Liberum in bono non erit quod liberator non liberauerit. In bono liber eſſe nullus poteſt niſi fuerit liberatus.

[f] Epiſt. 47. Boni ipſam bonam voluntatem per Dei gratiam conſecuti ſunt. Et poſt: Gratia intelligitur voluntates hominum ipſas ex malis bonas facere, ipſas etiam quas fecerit cuſtodire: & ante, Omnia onus ad mores noſtros pertinent quibus rectè viuimus à patre noſtro qui in cœlis eſt docuit eſſe poſcendis, ne de libero præſumentes arbitrio a diuina gratia deciderimus.

keth in it to doe. [t] *Of that as touching which wee are ſomewhat in the faith of Chriſt, how much ſoeuer it be, we may take nothing to our ſelues, but we muſt giue the glory of all vnto God.* The new goſpellers therefore according to the doctrine of the auncient Goſpell, deteſt the Manichees for denying *Free will* in ſinne and euill; and deteſt alſo Pelagians and Papiſts, for attributing to *Free will* an ability and power of it owne, whereby to apply it ſelfe to righteouſneſſe; which whereas *M. Biſhop* ſaith the Pelagians affirmed *without grace*, I haue before ſhewed, that he ſaith vntruly, and that the Papiſts doe now teach in that behalfe the verie ſame that the Pelagians did. To the laſt place the anſwer is ready by that that hath beene ſaid; *Free will* and grace, are not the one excluded by the other, neither is the one denied in the affirming of the other, if we make the one the cauſe of the other, as *Auſtine* doth, and teach it to bee the worke of grace to make the will *Free*. But grace is denied in the preaching of *Free will*, if as touching ſaluation it be affirmed to haue any *freedome* which it hath not of grace, or any thing at all bee attributed vnto it which is not the effect of grace. For [u] *man doth not by freedome of will attaine to grace, but by grace obtaineth freedome of will*; and though it be in the will, and by the will, that we receiue grace, yet [x] *in all men the will of God himſelfe is the cauſe of the receiuing of the grace of God*

[t] *Dever. Apoſt ſer. 11. Nihil ex eo quod aliquid ſumus, ſi tamen in eius fide aliquid ſumus quantumcunque ſumus nihil nobis arrogemus, ne & quod accepimus perdamus; ſed in eo quod accepimus, illi gloriã demus:*

[u] *De corrept & grat. cap. 8. Voluntas humana non libertate conſequitur gratiam ſed gratia potius libertatem.*

[x] *Proſper de vocat. gent. lib. 1. cap. 5. Omnibus hominibus percipiendæ gratiæ cauſa voluntas Dei eſt.*

## 16. W. Biſhop.

*Now in few words I will paſſe ouer the obiections which he frameth in our names: But miſapplieth them.*

Firſt obiection. *That man can do good by nature, as giue almes, do iuſtice, ſpeake the truth, &c. and therefore will them without the helpe of grace. This argument wee vſe to proone libertie of will in ciuill and morall matters, euen in the corrupted ſtate of man, and it doth demonſtrat it: and* M. Perkins *in his third concluſion doth graunt it. And his anſwer heere is farre from the purpoſe, for albeit (ſaith hee) touching the ſubſtance of the worke it bee good, yet it faileth both in the beginning, becauſe it proceeds not from a pure heart, and a faith vnfained: and alſo in the end, which is not the glorie of God.*

Anſwer. *It faileth neither in the one nor other: for that almes may iſſue out of a true naturall compaſſion, which is a ſufficient good fruit and*

*to make a worke morally good: faith and grace do purge the heart, and are neceſſarie onely for good and meritorious workes: Againe, beeing done to releeue the poore mans neceſſity, God his Creator and Maſter, is thereby glorified. And ſo albeit the man thought not of God in particular: yet God beeing the finall end of all good, any good action of it ſelfe, is directed towards him, when the man putteth no other contrarie end thereunto.*

## R. Abbot.

*Proſper. de lib arbit. Proclamas cauendum eſſe ne ita ad Deum omnia ſanctorum merita referamus, vt nihil niſi quod malũ eſt humanæ aſcribamus naturæ.*

It was a caution giuen by the Pelagians, [a] *that wee may not ſo attribute to God all the merits or good workes of holy men, as that wee aſcribe to the nature of man not thing but that that is euill.* This caution the Papiſt, not willing in any thing to ſwarue from the Pelagian hereſie, doe very religiouſly obſerue. For the proouing of *Free will* they obiect vnto vs that *man can doe good by nature, as giue almes, doe iuſtice, &c. and therefore can will theſe things without the helpe of grace. M. Biſhop* ſaith they vſe this argument *to proouue libertie of will in ciuill and morall matters.* But therefore very lewdly do they [b] vſe it againſt vs, and exclaime that wee by deniall of *Free will*, make lawes and exhortations and inſtructions of no effect, when as wee denie not *liberty and freedome of will in morall and ciuill actions.* Yet of ſuch workes wee ſay, that although in morall and ciuill life they ſtand for good, yet ſpiritually and with God they are not *good workes* but euill, becauſe howſoeuer there is the outward matter and ſubſtance, yet there wanteth the inward forme and life whereby they ſhould haue the condition of *good workes*. Heereof *M. Perkins* ſaith, *that the good thing done by a naturall man is a ſinne in reſpect of the doer, becauſe it failes both for his right beginning, which is a pure heart, a good conſcience, and a faith vnfeined, as alſo for his end, which is the glorie of God.* But ſaith *M. Biſhop*, it faileth neither in the one nor in the other, for that almes may iſſue out of a true naturall compaſſion, which is a ſufficient good fountaine to make a worke morally good. Where I wonder whether he did well aduiſe of that he ſaith. For if *naturall compaſſion* be a ſufficient *good* fountaine to make a worke morally good, then becauſe bruit beaſts haue *true naturall compaſſion*, and true naturall affections, wee muſt needs attribute to them vertuous and morall actions. But *S. Auſtin* was not of *M.*

[b] *Coſter. Enchirid cap. 5.*

*Biſhops*

*Bishops* mind when he said, [c] *Beleeue in him that iustifieth the vngodlie, that thy workes may be good workes. For I will not call them good workes, so long as they proceede not from a good root. Faith* then, by *Saint Austins* iudgement, is the good root whence good workes must grow: and if they grow not from this root, they cannot bee called *good*. And this hee learned of the Apostle, teaching vs, that [d] *without faith it is vnpossible to please God, and that* [e] *whatsoeuer is not of faith, it is sinne.* And therefore of *naturall compassion*, he saith, that [f] *although in it selfe it be a good worke, yet he vseth this good worke amisse, that vseth it vnbeleeuingly, and doth it amisse, that doth it vnbeleeuingly. Now hee that doth any thing amisse*, saith hee, *sinneth therein; and therefore the good workes which vnbeleeuers doe are Gods, who vseth to good purpose them that are euill: but to them that doe them they are sinnes, in that they doe good things amisse, because they doe them with an vnbeleeuing, that is, with a foolish and corrupt will.* Wherein he accordeth with the Apostle, saying, that [g] *to vnbeleeuers all things are vncleane, because euen their minde and conscience is defiled.* And thereto *Prosper* alluding, saith, that [h] *in the mindes of the vngodly albeit there bee found many commendable things, yet there dwelleth no vertue, but all their workes are polluted and vncleane, whilest therin they are subiect to him who did first fall by apostasie from God.* Therefore *M. Bishops* distinction of *good workes* and *meritorious workes*, is an idle and vaine presumption, there being no workes meritorious at all, nor any workes good, but onely such as are done in the faith of Christ. The other circumstance required by *M. Perkins* in *good workes*, is the end wherto they are referred. For *Austin* rightly saith, [i] *that workes are not esteemed by the actions, but by the ends, so that when a man doth a thing wherein he seemeth not to sinne, if he doe it not for that end for which he should doe it, that which hee doth becommeth thereby sinne.* Now the true and proper end of all good workes, and which maketh them good, is *the glorie of God*, of which the Apostle saith, [k] *Whether ye eat or drinke, or whatsoeuer ye doe, doe all to the glory of God*; and of which *Prosper* telleth vs, that [l] *albeit a*

[c] *Aug. in Psa. 31. Crede in eum qui iustificat impium, vt possint opera tua esse opera bona; nam nec bona illa appellauerim, quamdiu non de radice bona procedunt.*

[d] Heb. 11. 6.

[e] Rom. 14. 23.

[f] *August. contra Iulian. li 4. cap. 3. Etsi misericordia ipsa per seipsam naturali compassione opus est bonum, etiam isto bono male vtitur qui infideliter vtitur, & hoc bonum malè facit qui infideliter facit. Qui autem malè facit aliquid, profectò peccat. Ex quo colligitur etiam ipsa bona opera quæ faciunt infideles, non ipsorum esse, sed illius qui bonè vtitur malis: ipsorum autem esse peccata, quibus & bona malè faciunt, quia ea non fideli, sed infideli, hoc est, stulta & noxia faciunt voluntate.*

[g] Tit. 1. 15.

[h] *Prosper. de lib. arbit. Patet in impiorum animis nullam habitare virtutem, sed omnia opera eorum immunda esse atque pollutа, &c. dum ea ipsa quæ non haberent, nisi dante Deo, subduntur ei qui primus recessit à Deo. Et post. Multa laudabilia reperiuntur etiam in ingeniis impiorum, quæ ex natura quidem prodeunt; sed quoniam ab eo qui naturam condidit, recesserunt, virtutes esse non possunt.*

[i] *Aug. cont. Iulian. lib. 4. cap. 3. Naturæ non officijs, sed finibus & vtrâ discernendas esse virtutes, &c. Cùm itaque facit homo aliquid vbi peccare non videtur, si non propter hoc facit, propter quod facere debet, peccare conuincitur.*

[k] 1 Cor. 10. 31.

[l] *Prosper. de vocat. Gent. lib. 1. cap. 2. Etsi misericors bonis moribus agat, malè adhuc viuit, si non in gloriam Dei viuit.*

*manlue in good behauiour*, yet *he liueth ſtill an euill life, if he liue not to the glorie of God.* But heereto belongeth the *knowledge of God*, which is[m] *as it were the leauen that ſeaſoneth the whole life of man.* And this *knowledge* of God muſt bee by *the word of God*, ſo that [n] *they who without the word of truth doe worke or ſpeake any thing, are as they that ſtriue to goe without feet.* And it muſt breede the loue of God, becauſe[o] *chaſtitie*, and ſo the like, *are not vertues except they be done or obſerued for the loue of God.* And in the loue of God conſiſteth *the worſhip of God*,[p] *without which worſhip of the true God, euen that that ſeemeth to be vertue is ſinne*, and therefore it offended *Auſtin*, and he retracted it as a thing miſſe-ſpoken, that hee had ſaid [q] *that the Philoſophers ſhined with the light of vertue, who were not endued with true pietie or religion towards God.* A part of which *pietie* it is in all our good workes, to haue a reſpect vnto him, to doe them for his ſake, thereby intending to ſerue, and obey, and to pleaſe him, ſo that[r] *vaine is euery action, and euery ſpeech that hath not ſomewhat inwardly for God, and for the commandement of God*: and[s] *when vertues are referred to themſelues, and deſired onely for themſelues, and not for ſome other reſpect* (to God) *they are ſwelling and proud, and are not to be accounted for vertues, but vices.* And this reſpect to God muſt acknowledge him to bee the giuer of all our vertue and goodneſſe, and that wee doe but ſerue him with his owne, ſo that[t] *although to clothe a naked man*, or any other ſuch like worke, *by it ſelfe be not a ſinne, yet of ſuch a worke not to glorie in the Lord, and not to referre it to him as the Author of it, none but a wicked man will denie it to be a ſinne.* Now theſe conditions and circumſtances being required to make a worke *good it may bee that a man minding to doe a ſeruice, may commit an offeuſe, if he doe not firſt learne in what ſort he ſhould doe it.* Which a man cannot learne by *Free will*, and by the law of nature, and therefore offendeth euen in thoſe things wherein hee ſeemeth outwardly to doe well. But *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that in ſuch workes *God is glorified, becauſe albeit the man thought not of God in particular, yet God being the finall end of all good, any good action of it ſelfe is directed towards him, when the*

[m] *Arnob. contr. gent. lib. 2. Cognitio Dei fermentum quoddam eſt vitæ.*

[n] *Clemen. Alexand. in Protrept. Quis abſque verbo veritatis operantur aliquid vel loquuntur, ſunt ſimiles iis qui conantur ingredi abſque pedibus.*

[o] *Idem. Strom. lib 3. Nec caſtitas eſt bonum & ex virtute, niſi fiat propter dilectionem in Deum.*

[p] *Proſper. de vocat. gent. lib. 1. cap. 3. Sine cultu veri Dei etiam quod virtus videtur eſſe peccatum eſt, nec placere vllus Deo ſine Deo poteſt.*

[q] *Auguſtin. Retract. lib. 1. cap. 3. Diſplicet mihi quod philoſophos non vera pietate prædictos dixi virtutis luce fulſiſſe.*

[r] *Origen. in Numer. hom. 25. Inanis eſt omnis actus, & omnis ſermo in quo non eſt intrinſecus aliquid pro Deo & pro mandato Dei.*

[s] *Auguſt. de ciuit. Dei, lib. 19. cap. 25. Virtutes cum ad ſeipſas referuntur, nec propter aliud expetuntur, etiam tunc inflatæ & ſuperbæ ſunt:* [t] *Idem contr. Julian. Pelag. lib. 4. cap. 3. Non quia per ſeipſum factum quod eſt operis nudum peccatum eſt, ſed de tali opere non in Domino gloriari ſolus in. pius negat eſſe peccatum. Et ante: Cùm non ad ſuum authorem referuntur dona Dei, hoc ipſo mali his vtentes afficiuntur iniuſti.* [u] *Arnob. in Pſal. 26. Fieri poterit vt obſequendi voto offendam, ſi qualiter debeam aut non diſcam.*

man

*man putteth no other contrarie end thereunto.* Where we may iustly wonder, that so absurd a fancie should preuaile with him, that God should bee glorified there where hee is neither thought of nor knowne, and that actions should be directed to God, where there is nothing to direct them; that mens actions are the directors of themselues, and that though a man haue no meaning to glorifie God, yet hee doth glorifie him, so long as hee propoundeth not to himselfe a contrarie end. These are *M. Bishops* dreames, and vpon the credit heereof wee must beleeue, that the Gentiles knowing none but idoll gods, yet did glorifie God in those workes wherein they did not put a contrary end: nay, the bruit creatures doe direct their workes of naturall compassion to the glorie of God, for their naturall compassion is a sufficient good fountaine to make their workes good, and they propound no end contrarie to the glorie of God. But *S. Austin* telleth vs, that [x] *it is the intent that maketh the worke good, and that it is faith that directeth the intent*; and therefore where there is neither intent to glorifie God, nor faith to direct the intent thereto, there cannot bee any glorifying of God, neither can the worke that is done bee called a good worke. *M. Bishop* therefore doth amisse to ioine with the Pelagians, [y] *to bring in a kinde of men, which without the faith of Christ, by the law of nature can please God. This is it*, saith *S. Austin* to them, *for which the Church of Christ most highly doth detest you.* I will end this point with the resolution of *Origen*: [z] *Euery good worke*, saith he, *which men seeme to doe, except they doe it in the worship of God, in the acknowledgement and confession of God, it is but bootlesse and vaine. I will boldly say that they doe all in vaine, if they doe it not in faith: they doe all to no purpose, except they doe it in the acknowledgement of one God the Father and in the confession of his onely begotten Sonne Iesus Christ, and by the enlightening of the holy Ghost. He that doth a worke of righteousnesse being a stranger from the true worship of God, and from true faith, he doth it to no good, he doth it in destruction, it profiteth him not, it helpeth him not in the day of wrath. Whereof the Apostle is witnesse, saying, What-*

[x] *Aug. in Psal. 31. Bonum opus intentio facit: intentionem fides dirigit.*

[y] *Contr. Iulian. Pelag. lib. 4. ca. 3. Introducens hominum genus, quod Deo placere possit, sine fide Christi, lege naturæ. Hoc est vnde vos maximè Christiana detestatur Ecclesia.*

[z] *Origen. in Iob. lib. 1. Omne opus bonum quod visi fuerint homines facere, nisi in Dei cultura, nisi in Dei agnitione atque confessione fecerint, sine causa faciunt & supervacuè. Audenter dicam, omnia gratis faciunt, si non in fide fecerint: sine causa agunt nisi in agnitione vnius Dei Patris & in confessione filij eius Domini nostri Iesu Christi, & illuminationè Sp. Sancti hæc fecerint. Omnem iustitiam qui foris a vera Dei cultura atque vera fide fecerit, gratis facit, in perditione facit, non prodest ei, non adiuuat eum ad hæc, &c. Ad quod testis est Apostolus: Omne quod ex fide, &c. Quare? Quia bona faciſſe videntur non quæsita ex ea quæ sit agnitione eius propter quem hæc fecerint. A quo enim accipiet mercedem? Ab eo quem non requisiit? quem non agnouit, cui non credidit, quem non est confessus, non accipiet ab eo remunerationem, nisi iudicium, & iram, & condemnationem &c. Sicut enim nihil est delectabile hominibus sine luce, sic nihil est delectabile neque acceptum Deo absque ista lumine.*

soeuer

*ſoeuer is not of faith is ſinne. Why ſo? becauſe he hath not the faith and knowledge of him for whoſe ſake hee ſhould doe it. For of whom ſhall hee receiue reward? Of him whom hee hath not ſought after, whom hee knoweth not, whom he beleeueth not, nor confeſſeth? He ſhall receiue no reward of him, but iudgement, and wrath, and condemnation. For as nothing is delightſome to vs without light, ſo is nothing delightſome or pleaſing to God without the light of faith.* Onely this I will adde, that God to ſuch actions amongſt the Gentiles gaue temporall rewards for temporall reſpects, not to ſhew any approbation thereof in reſpect of himſelfe, to whom the doers thereof had no reſpect, but only to entertaine the liking thereof, for the common good of mankinde, and for the maintenance of ciuill order and ſocietie, which God would vſe to ſuch ends, and in ſuch ſort as pleaſed him for the benefit of his Church. And therefore euen them who moſt excelled in the renowme and commendation of theſe vertues, God ſometimes gaue ouer temporally alſo to ſuch ends as to the world ſeemed vnworthie to their former life, to ſhew that hee ſtood not in any ſort bound to them for the vertues, if wee ſo call them, wherein they had not reſpected him, in that he would neither be the defender of them in this world, nor the rewarder of them in the world to come.

## 17. W. Bishop.

2 Obiection. *God hath commanded all to beleeue and repent: therefore they haue naturall Free will, by vertue whereof, being helped by the ſpirit of God, they can beleeue. The force of the argument conſiſteth in this, that God being a good Lord, will not command any man to doe that which he is no way able to doe.*

Anſwer. M. Perkins *anſwereth in effect (for his words bee obſcure) that God commanderh that which wee bee not able to performe, but that which wee ſhould doe. Then I hope hee will admit that hee will enable vs by his grace to doe it, or elſe how ſhould wee doe it? God ſurely doth not binde vs by commandement to any impoſſible thing: hee is not tyrant, but telleth vs,* that his yoke is ſweet, and his burden eaſie. *And* Saint Iohn *witneſſeth*, that his commandements are not heauie. *Hee was farre off from thinking that God would tie any man by law to doe that which hee was altogether vnable*

Matt. 11. Ioh. 5.

*vnable to performe. That in the end M. Perkins himselfe approueth.*

R. ABBOT.

Where they obiect, that God commandeth all to beleeue and repent, and therefore that all haue *Free will* to doe that which hee commandeth, *M. Perkins* answereth, that the argument is not good, *because God by such commandements doth not shew what men are able to doe, but what they should doe, though of themselues they cannot doe it.* Which answer why *M. Bishop* calleth *obscure*, I know not, but that his head haply fell out to bee somewhat cloudie when hee came to consider of it. Yet hee replieth, *then I hope that hee will admit, that he will enable vs by his grace to doe it, or else how should we doe it?* We will admit, that God by his grace enableth whom hee thinketh good, to doe his commandements for the state of his life so farre as hee thinketh good, and to them onely *the yoke of Christ is sweet, and his burden easie, and his commandements not grieuous*, because of him [a] *they receiue a gift whereby they become not grieuous vnto them.* And to these the vse of the law and commandements doth properly belong, which God did not deliuer as expecting that any man could fulfill the same, [b] but thereby to bring men to the knowledge *of sinne*, and of condemnation thereby due vnto them, that by this meanes he might moue them whom he would call, to apprehend that meanes of saluation which he had promised in Iesus Christ; who by his spirit giuen vnto them [c] *delight in the law of God as touching the inner man*, but by the *rebellion of the law of sinne*, are holden backe in this life from attaining to the perfect righteousnesse of the law. To the rest the law is a conuiction of sinne, no helpe of righteousnesse; whilst God [d] *by vnsearchable, but iust iudgement*, denieth to them that grace, which to others he vouchsafeth, because [e] *he sheweth mercie to whom hee will, and whom he will he hardeneth.* Albeit that man is vnable to fulfill the law, it is not any default of God, but of man himselfe, and therefore there was no cause why [f] the iust God should diminish any thing of the rule of righteousnesse, though vnrighteous man had by sinne disabled himselfe of the performance thereof; the righteousnesse of God I say, required, that God should institute himselfe from seeming to approoue any sinne by the defect of the commandement, howsoeuer

[a] *Aug. de perfect. iustitia. Cui grauia sunt, intelligat se nondum accepisse donum quo grauia non sint.*

[b] *Amb. in Galat. cap. 3. Lex ad hoc data est, vt peccatores reos se scirent apud Deum. Manifestatis enim peccatis suis, conclusi sunt, vt se excusare non possent, sed quærerent misericordiam, &c.*

[c] Rom. 7. 22.

[d] *August. de bono perseuer. cap. 14.*

[e] Rom. 9. 18.

[f] *Aug. de peccat. merit. & remiss. li. 2. ca. 16. Neque peccatum erit quod erit si non diuinitus iubeatur vt non sit. Et iterum, Quomodo non vetatur per iustitiam si peccatum est?*

euer man could not iuſtifie himſelfe from ſinne by the keeping of it. But of the end of Gods giuing the law and the poſſibility of keeping it, there will bee occaſion afterwards to entreate more largely, and therefore with this briefe anſwer I referre that point to his due place.

18. W. BISHOP.

3. Obiect. *If man haue no Free will to ſinne or not to ſinne, then no man is to be puniſhed for his ſinnes, becauſe he ſinneth by a neceſſitie, not to be auoided.*

*He anſwereth, that the reaſon is not good, for though man cannot but ſinne, yet is the fault in himſelfe, and therefore is to be puniſhed. Againſt* 1.Pet.3. *which, I ſay that this anſwer ſuppoſeth that which is falſe, to wit, that a man in ſinne cannot chuſe but ſinne: For by the helpe of God, who deſireth all ſinners conuerſion, and thereunto affoordeth grace ſufficient, a ſinner in a moment may call for grace and repent him, and ſo chuſe whether he will ſinne or no, and conſequently hath Free will to ſinne, or not to ſinne: And that example of a bankrupt is not to purpoſe; for he cannot when he will ſatisfie his creditors, who content not themſelues with his repentance, without repay of their mony, as God doth.*

*Now concerning the force of this argument, heare* Saint Auguſtines *opinion,* De duab. animab. contr. Manich. *in theſe words:* Neither are wee heere to ſearch obſcure bookes to learne, that no man is worthie of diſpraiſe or puniſhment, which doth not that which hee cannot doe: for (*ſaith hee*) doe not ſhepheards vpon the downes ſing theſe things? Doe not Poets vpon the ſtages act them? Do not the vnlearned in their aſſemblies, and the learned in their libraries, acknowledge them? Doe not maſters in their ſchooles, and Prelats in their pulpits, and finally all mankinde thorowout the whole world, confeſſe and teach this, *to wit, that no man is to bee puniſhed, becauſe hee did that which he could not chuſe but doe? Should hee not then (according to* S Auguſtines *cenſure) bee hiſſed out of all honeſt companie of men, that denieth this ſo manifeſt a truth, confeſſed by all Mankind? How groſſe is this hereſie, that ſo hoodeth a man, and hardneth him, that be he learned, yet hee bluſheth not to deny roundly, that which is ſo euident in reaſon, that euen naturall ſence doth teach it vnto ſhepheards. God of his infinita mercie, deliuer vs from this ſtrange light of the new Goſpell.*

R. A-

R. ABBOT.

As touching ciuill and outward actions, wee doubt not, as before is said, but that God hath left a liberty and power to the will of man, and therefore iustly are they punished, who runne wilfully into enormous actions from which it is in them to forbeare. And this addeth much to the iust condemnation of man, that euen in those things wherein he hath power to doe otherwise, yet he carieth himselfe frowardly and rebelliously against God. And yet of outward actions in some degree, *Hierome* rightly obserueth, [a] *that a man can forbeare to sin if he will at a time or in some place, or by some let of bodily weakenes, or so long as the mind is intent and heedy*, but he soone findeth, that wholy not to *sinne it is not possible* To speake then indefinitely of sinne, it is true that man left in the power of his owne *Free will* cannot chuse but sinne. For how can hee chuse but sinne, who of himselfe is nothing but sinne? Yea we know, that the corruption of sinne lieth as a punishment vpon the whole nature of man, and therefore is said to haue befallen [b] *by the iust reuenge of God*, and is called [c] *Pœnalis vitiositas, a pœnall vitiousnesse*, or subiection to sinne. Now if it be as it were a prison or punishment, it is not in our choice to bee rid thereof, because a man cannot rid himselfe of a prison or punishment, which he hath drawne vppon himselfe. And therefore doth Saint *Austin* affirme it to bee [d] *the punishment of man by condemnation, to approoue falshood for truth, so as to erre against his will, and being vexed with the griefe of the bond of the flesh, yet not to bee able to temper himselfe from libidinous actions*. Thus haue we heard him before to auouch [e] *a necessitie of sinning*, and this necessitie hee acknowledgeth in some part to continue still in the state of grace, [f] alleging therefore the words of the Prophet *Dauid*: [g] *De necessitatibus meis educ me: Deliuer mee from all my necessities*. And therefore vainly doth *M. Bishop* except, that by the *helpe of God a sinner may call for grace and repent him, and chuse whether he will sinne or no*. For in men conuerted, it is true that they cannot chuse but sinne; in repentant men it is still true that they cannot chuse but sinne. For the forbearing of this or that action doth not put a man in case to chuse to sinne, but though hee arise one way, yet the *law of sinne* holdeth him still vnder a necessitie to fall another way, vntill [h] *this euill necessitie be taken away, and full liberty*

[a] *Hieron. contra Pelag. lib. 3. Dicimus posse hominem non peccare si velit pro tempore, pro loco, pro imbecillitate corporea, quamdiu intentus est animus, &c.*

[b] *Quod si se paululum remiserit, &c. discit fragilitatem suam, & multa se non posse cognoscit.*

[c] *Aug. de nat. & grat. cap. 34.*

[d] *Idem. de perfect. iustit. Rat. 9.*

[e] *De nat. & grat. cap 67. ex lib. 3. de lib. arbit. ca. 18. Approbare falsa pro veris vt erret inuitus, & resistente atque torquente dolore carnalis vinculi non posse à libidinosis operibus temperare, non est naturæ institutæ hominis, sed pœna damnatis.*

[f] *Sect. 3.*

[g] *De nat. & grat. cap. 66. Psal. 24. 18.*

[h] *August. de nat. & grat. c. 66. Opitulante gratia, &c. Quando mala necessitas removebitur, & liberatas plena tribuetur.*

liberty granted, which shall [i] then bee, when wee shall see him face to face. Or if *M. Bishop* will say otherwise, let him bring vs foorth the man that can chuse to sinne; the man that can doe more then euer Patriarch, or Prophet, or Apostle, or Euangelist could doe. For if they could chuse to sinne, why did they sinne? or if they did not sinne, why did they say, *Forgiue vs our trespasses?* If hee will needs follow the Pelagian deuice, that [k] though no man be indeede without sinne, yet a man may be so if he will, I will answer him with *Hieromes* words, [l] *What a reason is this, that that may be that neuer was, and that hee should yeeld that to I know not whom, which in the Patriarkes, and Prophets, and Apostles he cannot proeue?* Repentance therefore and conuersion so altereth the course of a mans life in the maine, as that euen in the way of righteousnesse it still leaueth in him a necessitie of sinne. Neither doth this conuersion stand indifferent to all, as hee dreameth, nor doth God affoord to all sinners grace sufficient to bring them to repentance. He noteth for his purpose the place of *Peter, that God would not haue any to perish, &c.* but let him take the whole words, and they will cleere themselues, [m] *He is patient* TOVVARDS VS, *not willing that any* (namely *of vs*) *should perish, but that all* (*of vs*) *should come to repentance.* He speaketh of Gods elect, of them whom he hath chosen to make vp the body of his Church, of whom our Sauiour Christ saith, [n] *This is the will of the Father that hath sent mee, that of all that hee hath giuen me I should lose nothing, but should raise it vp at the last day.* Of these hee will haue none to perish, but doth patiently beare til he haue accomplished the number that he hath decreed for himselfe. So did God say by the Prophet, [o] *As I liue, saith the Lord, I desire not the death of a sinner, but rather that he be conuerted and liue:* but he said it to *the house of Israel*; he said it not to the Philistims; he said it not to the Babyloniani, the Ammonits, the Moabits, &c. It was not for their sakes that he *sware*, but [p] *willing to shew to the heires of promise the stablenesse of his counsell, he bound himselfe by an oath.* Therefore to those peoples he gaue not the meanes of conuersion [q], *he gaue his word vnto Iacob, his statutes and ordinances vnto Israel; he dealt not so with any other nation.* How then doth M. *Bishop* say, that God *affordeth to all sinners grace sufficient for their conuersion?* Will he say that the beholding of heauen and earth, and such other naturall motiues, were sufficient to bring men to repentance? Hee may dally with vs, that in themselues

[i] *Idem. in Ioann. tract. 41. Quando plena atque perfecta libertas erit? Quando nulle inimicitiæ: Quando notissima inimica destruetur mors.*

[k] *Hieron. epist. ad Ctesiph. Licet alius non fuerit, tamen potest esse qui esse voluerit.*

[l] *Ibid. Quæ est argumentatio ista, posse esse quod nunquam fuerit, &c. & dare cuilibet quod in Patriarchis, & Prophetis, & Apostolis nequeat approbare?*

[m] 2. Pet. 3. 9.

[n] Joh. 6. 39.

[o] Ezech. 33. 11.

[p] Heb. 6. 17.

[q] Psal. 147. 19.

ſelues they were ſuch as might ſufficientlie auaile to moue men; but what is that to the purpoſe, ſo long as to the ſtate and condition of man they were not ſufficient? The light of the Sunne is a ſufficient light, and yet it is not ſufficient to make a blind man ſee. What were all thoſe motiues and occaſions whatſoeuer they were, but euen as a good leſſon to a dead man? And what, will hee terme thoſe meanes of conuerſion by the name of *grace*? Away, away with this Pelagian conceipt, and let vs acknowledge the truth as *S. Auſtine* doth; [r] *Communis eſt omnibus natura, non gratia: Nature is common to all, but grace is not ſo.* It is but [s] *a glaſſie tricke of wit*, as hee ſaith, to deuiſe a grace that is common to all: it maketh a faire ſhew, but it is ſoone cracke.

[r] *Aug. de verb. Apoſt. Ser. 11.*
[s] *Videte acumen ſed vitreum. Quaſi lucet vanitate, ſed frangitur veritate.*

Now *M. Perkins*, alledging that becauſe it is by mans owne default that hee cannot chuſe but ſinne, therefore hee is notwithſtanding iuſtlie puniſhed, bringeth for declaration thereof the example of *a bankrupt, who is not therefore freed from his debts becauſe he is not able to pay them, but the bils againſt him ſtand in force, becauſe the debt comes through his owne default.* But *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that this example *is not to the purpoſe, becauſe the bankrupt cannot, when he will, ſatisfie his creditors, who content not themſelues with his repentance, without repay of their money, as God doth.* How many miles to London? a poke-full of plummes. What is this to the purpoſe, that God is content to remitte his debtors without ſatisfaction? for ſo creditors alſo deale ſometimes with bankrupts when they haue nought to pay: but is this any thing againſt that which *M. Perkins* ſaith, that by the example of a bankrupt, it appeareth that a man may iuſtly bee puniſhed for that which now hee cannot helpe, becauſe by his owne default hee is runne into it? The creditor may remit all if he will, but otherwiſe the bils of debt are iuſtlie liable againſt him who by default and negligence is come to that paſſe that hee hath nothing to pay. And yet in his exception there are two abſurdities implied. For it is abſurd that hee ſaith that God doth remitte and pardon his debtors without ſatisfaction. There is no man reconciled to God, but by tendring a full and perfect ſatisfaction, which becauſe hee hath not to do of his owne, therefore by faith hee pleadeth the paiment of his ſuretie Ieſus Chriſt, [t] *who bare our ſinnes in his body vpon the tree*; that in [u] *him weemight haue redemption through his bloud, euen the forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes.*

[t] *1. Pet. 2. 24.*
[u] *Eph. 1. 7.*

Now [x] *all men haue not faith*, and therefore all men cannot pleade this ſatisfaction for themſelues, and yet without this faith there is no repentance that can auaile to bring vs vnto God. And ſeeing both [y] *faith* and [z] *repentance* are *the gifts of God*, which [a] hee giueth to ſome, and to other ſome doth not giue, it is an other point of abſurditie to ſubiect the gift of God to the arbitrarie will and power of man, as if man haue in him to beleeue and repent whenſoeuer himſelfe will. But againſt this *M. Biſhop* for concluſion bringeth a place of *Auſtine* againſt the Manichees, that [b] *ſhepheards and poets, and learned, and vnlearned, and ſchoolemaſters, and prelats, and all mankind confeſſe, that noman is worthy of diſpraiſe or puniſhment, which doth not that which hee cannot doe.* Nay, to helpe the man ſomewhat, I will adde more out of the next chapter to that which hee citeth; [c] *That a man ſhould bee holden guiltie for not doing that which hee could not do, it is a point of iniquitie and madneſſe to affirme.* Now what a ſtrange matter is this, that ſhepheards and poets, and all ſorts of men, ſhould ſee reaſon to affirme this, and yet *M. Biſhop* perforce ſhould be driuen to denie it? For let vs aske him in his owne profeſſion and doctrine what hee thinketh of children dying vnbaptized? Hee will giue vs a peremptorie anſwer, that queſtionleſſe they are damned. But what haue poore infants done why they ſhould bee damned, or how could they auoid that for which they are damned? Tell vs *M. Biſhop*, how could they chuſe to bee other then they bee, and if they cannot chuſe but bee that they are, how can it ſtand with your rule, that they ſhould bee condemned for beeing that which they cannot chuſe but bee? Perforce he muſt take a fall in his owne trippe, neither can hee giue an anſwer as touching this point, which doth not yeeld vs a full anſwer againſt himſelfe. But *S. Auſtine* himſelfe cleereth this point for vs, who, vſing the words cited by *M. Biſhop* to iuſtifie a diffinition of ſinne which hee had ſet downe againſt the Manichees, that [d] *ſinne is deſire of retaining or obtaining that which iuſtice forbiddeth, and whence it is in a mans liberty to abſtaine*, telleth his Reader in the peruſing of that place in his Retractions, that hee ſpake there of that [e] *which is onely ſinne, and is not alſo the puniſhment of ſinne. For in that ſinne which is alſo the puniſhment of ſinne, how little is it that the will can doe againſt concupiſcence or luſt hauing dominion ouer it,*

and

[x] 2. Theſſ. 3. 2.
[y] Ephe. 2. 8.
[z] Act. 5. 31. & 11. 18.
[a] *Aug. de predeſt. ſanct. cap. 6. & de bono perſeuer. cap. 14. Aliis præparatur, aliis non præparatur voluntas à Domino. Illis qui veritatis exhortationem obedienter audiunt, ipſum donum Dei datum eſt, hoc eſt, obedienter audire: illis autem qui non ſic audiunt non eſt datum.*
[b] *Aug. de duabus animab. cont. Manich. ca. 11. Nemo vituperatione ſupplicio ve dignus eſt qui id non faciat quod facere non poteſt. Nonne iſta cantant & in montibus paſtores & in theatris poetæ, &c.*
[c] *Ibid. cap. 12. Peccati reum teneri quenquam quia non fecit quod facere non potuit ſummæ iniquitatis eſt & inſaniæ.*
[d] *Ibid. cap. 11. Peccatum eſt voluntas retinendi vel conſequendi quod iuſtitia vetat, eſtq; vnde liberum eſt abſtinere.*
[e] *Retract. lib. 1. cap. 15. Id definitum eſt quod tantummodo peccatū eſt, non quod eſt etiam pœna peccati. Nam quando tale eſt vt idem ſit & pœna peccati quantum eſt quod valet voluntas ſub dominante cupiditate, niſi forte ſi pia eſt vt ores auxilium, &c.*

and therefore by reaſon hereof a man cannot do that that he ſhould doe, neither can hee but doe that that he ſhould not doe, which yet ceaſeth not to bee a ſinne and ſubiect to puniſhment, becauſe hee hath purchaſed this condition to himſelfe, by the merit of a former ſinne. For *Adam* had it in his power not to ſinne, and yet did ſinne by doing that which he ought not to doe, and was in his power and libertie not to do, and for this cauſe was giuen ouer as a priſoner to ſinne, that thenceforth he could not doe what he ought to doe, nor could chuſe but doe what hee ſhould not doe. Therefore the ſame *Auſtin* asking, if that rule that he hath ſet downe be true, how [f] *infants become guiltie, and are ſo holden*, anſwereth, that it is *by being borne of him who did not that that was in his power to doe.* In a word, man is not worthy of puniſhment for not doing that which hee cannot doe, except hee haue diſabled himſelfe for the doing of it; but if he haue diſabled himſelfe, as indeed he hath by the firſt ſinne, then is he iuſtly puniſhed, both for not doing that which hee once could, but now cannot doe, and for doing that which hee once could, but now cannot chuſe but doe. Which being a caſe very euident, and ſundrie times deliuered by S. *Auſtin*, in retracting the like places againſt the Manichees, may wee not wonder at the abſurd follie of this man, who for concluſion braueth in his termes, as if he had caried the matter very cleere, when indeede like an ignorant cauiller, he himſelfe vnderſtandeth not what he ſaith? We reſpect not what natural ſenſe doth teach to ſhepheards, but we cannot but thinke him an ill ſhepheard ouer the flocke of Chriſt, who taking vpon him to bee a Doctour of Diuinitie, is ſo ignorant in a principle of religion, which by the word of God euery ſhepheard ſhould know. God make him wiſe to ſee his owne folly, and then hee will ſubmit himſelfe in obedience to that truth which now in his ignorance ſeemeth vnto him a ſtrange light of a new Goſpell.

[f] *Ibid. Cur paruuli tenentur rei? Reſpondetur, quia ex eius origine tenentur qui non fecit quod facere potuit, dum unum ſcilicet ſeruare mandatum.*

## CHAPTER 2.

# OF ORIGINALL SINNE.

### 1. W. BISHOP.

### M. PERKINS FIRST CONCLVSION.

Pag. 28. *THey ſay, naturall corruption after Baptiſme is aboliſhed, and ſo ſay wee: but let vs ſee, how farre foorth it is aboliſhed. In Originall ſinne are three things. Firſt, the puniſhment, which is the firſt and ſecond death: ſecond, guiltineſſe, which is the binding vp of the creature vnto puniſhment: third, the fault, or the offending of God: vnder which I comprehend our guiltineſſe in* Adams *firſt offenſe, as alſo the corruption of the heart, which is a naturall inclination and proneneſſe to any thing that is euill, or againſt the law of God. For firſt we ſay, that after Baptiſme, in the regenerate the puniſhment of Originall ſinne is taken away:* For there is no condemnation (*ſaith the Apoſtle*) to them that
Rom. 8. 1. are in Chriſt Ieſus.

*For the ſecond, that is guiltineſſe, we further condeſcend and ſay, that it is alſo taken away in them that are borne anew. For conſidering there is no condemnation to them, there is nothing to bind them to puniſhment. Yet this caueat muſt be remembred, namely, that the guiltineſſe is removed from the perſon regenerate, but not from the ſinne in the perſon. But of this more hereafter.*

*Thirdly, the guilt in* Adams *firſt offenſe is pardoned. And touching the corruption of the heart. I anouch two things. Firſt, that the verie power and ſtrength, whereby it raigneth in man, is taken away in the regenerate. Secondly, that this corruption is aboliſhed, as alſo the fault of euery actuall ſinne paſt) ſo farre foorth as it is the fault and ſinne of the man in whom it is. Indeed it remaines till death, and it is ſinne, conſidered in it ſelfe, ſo long as it remaines; but it is not imputed to the perſon. And in that reſpect, is as though it were not, it being pardoned.* Hitherto M. Perkins.

### Annotations vpon our Conſents.

*Firſt, wee ſay not, that the puniſhment of Originall ſinne is in it,*

*or*

*or any part of it, but rather a due correction, and as it were an expulsion of it: this is but a peccadillo: but there lurketh a serpent in that caueat; that the guiltinesse of Originall sinne is removed from the person regenerate, but not from the sinne in the person. The like he saith afterward of the fault, that it is a sinne still in it selfe, remaining in the man till death, but it is not imputed to him, as being pardoned. Heere be quillets of very strange doctrine: the sinne is pardoned, and yet the guiltinesse of it is not taken away. Doth not a pardon take away from the fault pardoned, all bond of punishment due vnto it, and consequently al guiltinesse belonging to it? Who can denie this, vnlesse hee know not, or care not what he say? If then Originall sinne be pardoned, the guiltinesse of it is also removed from it selfe. Againe, what Philosophie, or reason alloweth vs to say that the offendor being pardoned for his offence, the offence in it selfe remaineth guiltie? as though the offense separated from the person, were a substance subiect to law, and capable of punishment. Can Originall sinne in it selfe die the first and second death, or be bound vp to them? What senselesse imaginations be these? Againe, how can the fault of Originall sinne remaine in the man renewed by Gods grace, although not imputed? Can there be two contraries in one part of the subiect at once? Cant here be light and darknesse in the vnderstanding, vertue and vice in the will at the same instant? Can the soule be both truly conuerted to God, and as truly auerted from him at one time? Is Christ now agreed to dwell with Belial, and the holy Ghost content to inhabit a body subiect to sinne? All which must be granted, contrary to both Scripture and naturall sense, if we admit the fault and deformitie of sinne to remaine in a man renewed, and endued with Gods grace: vnlesse wee would very absurdly imagine, that the fault and guilt of sinne were not inherent and placed in their proper subiects, but were drawne thence, and penned vp in some other odde corner.*

*Remember also, Gentle Reader, that heere* M. Perkins *affirmeth the power, whereby the corruption of the heart raigneth in man, is taken away in the regenerate: which is cleane contrarie vnto the first proposition of his first reason following, as shall be there proued.*

R. Abbot.

It was not *M. Perkins* intent heere to set downe any exact or formall description of *Originall sinne*, but only so to touch it, as might

seruc

ſerue to leade him to the point that was to bee diſputed of. But out of that which he ſaith it ariſeth, that *originall ſinne* is a common guilt of the firſt ſinne of man, inferring as a iuſt puniſhment, an vniuerſall diſtortion and corruption of mans nature, and euerlaſting deſtruction both of bodie and ſoule. Concerning the matter therefore he propoundeth three things in *Originall ſinne* to bee conſidered, the ſinne, the guilt, and the puniſhment. Where *M. Biſhop* being like a man of glaſſe, afraid of being crackt where he is not touched, would for more aſſurance giue vs a note, and I warrant you it is a wiſe one. *We ſay not*, ſaith he, *that the puniſhment of Originall ſinne is in it, or any part of it, but rather a due correction, and as it were an expulſion of it.* Where hee putteth mee in minde of a ſpeech that I haue heard concerning an outlandiſh Mathematicke Reader, whoſe tongue hauing out-runne his wits, and making a diſcourſe of hee knew not what, asketh his hearers at length, *Intelligitiſne? Doe yee vnderſtand mee?* they anſwered him, *No. Profectò nihil miror*, ſaith he, *neque enim ego intellego meipſum: Marry I doe not maruell, for neither do I vnderſtand my ſelfe.* Such a lecture doth *M. Biſhop* heere reade, which no man elſe vnderſtandeth, nor he himſelfe If he had vnderſtood what *Originall ſinne* is, and that *concupiſcence* being a part of *Originall ſinne*, is alſo a puniſhment thereof, (corruption of nature which is one part, ariſing from the guilt of the firſt ſinne, which is the other part) hee would not ſo vnaduiſedly haue denied, that the *puniſhment of Originall ſinne is alſo a part thereof*, eſpecially finding *S. Auſtin* in ſo infinite places affirming, that *concupiſcence* is in ſuch ſort a *ſinne*, as that it is alſo *a puniſhment of ſinne*; and of what ſinne, but that which *Adam* in perſon committed by action, and is ours *originally* by propagation? But that either this puniſhment of *Original ſinne* which is the corruption of nature, or the following puniſhment thereof, which is the firſt and ſecond death, ſhould bee called *expulſion of originall ſinne*, we lacke ſome *Oedipus* to reſolue vs. Sure I am that *M. Biſhop* vnderſtood not what he ſaid, nor can giue vs any anſwer to make it good. Such learned men haue we to doe with, which are ſo deepe in their points, that they know not what they ſay. Now hee that vttereth ſuch riddles himſelfe, might eaſilie pardon another man in a ſpeech though diſtaſting to him, yet in it ſelfe very eaſie to be vnderſtood. What a ſtirre doth he make at that that *M. Perkins* ſaith, that *in the regenerate the guiltineſſe is removed from the perſon,*

*perſon, but not from the ſinne in the perſon?* The meaning is plaine, that the *ſinne* is pardoned to the man regenerate, and therefore cannot make him guiltie, but yet in it ſelfe and in it owne nature, it continueth ſuch, as that ſetting aſide the pardon, it were ſufficient ſtill to make him guiltie and to condemne him, as ſhall bee afterwards auouched out of *Auſtin*, to euerlaſting death. The pardon acquitteth the man, but yet it cannot alter the nature of the ſinne: it ſetteth a barre againſt the effect, but take away the barre, & the cauſe is as ſtrong as it was before. His idle and waſt words, and fighting with a ſhadow, I let paſſe: if he were not a ſenſleſſe man, that that *M. Perkins* ſaith in the plaine meaning thereof, would neuer ſeeme to him any ſenſleſſe imagination. But he goeth further; *How can the fault of Originall ſinne remaine in the man renewed by Gods grace, although not imputed?* Why *M. Biſhop*? what hindereth I pray you? *Can there be two contraries*, ſaith he, *in one part of the ſubiect at once?* And why not? What? hath not his Philoſophie taught him, that *contraries* are *incompatible* onely in their *extremes*? Did hee neuer read, that contraries when they ſtriue to expell one another, doe it not in a moment, but by degrees; and though one be ſtronger then the other, yet the weaker ſtill hath that latitude which the ſtronger hath not gained? Thus are there in the regenerate man, [a] *the law of ſinne* and *the law of the mind*, the former *rebelling* againſt the latter; [b] *the fleſh and the ſpirite the one contrarie to the other*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, and that in one part of the ſubiect, as ſhall appeare. *Can there be light and darkneſſe in the vnderſtanding*, ſaith he? Why, did *M. Biſhop* neuer read of [c] *a darke day*? or will he reaſon thereof, if it be day, it cannot bee darke; or if it be darke it cannot be day? And if hee can ſee that light and darkneſſe may meete together in a day, can he not ſee that *light and darkneſſe* may alſo bee together in the vnderſtanding? One where our Sauiour Chriſt commendeth the light of his Diſciples; [d] *Bleſſed are your eyes, for they ſee*: another where he condemneth their darkneſſe, [e] *Haue ye eies and ſee not?* By light of vnderſtanding Peter ſaith, [f] *Thou art Chriſt the ſonne of the liuing God. Bleſſed art thou Simon*, ſaith Chriſt, *for fleſh and bloud hath not reuealed this vnto thee, but my Father which is in heauen.* The ſame Peter by and by alſo bewraieth *darkneſſe* of vnderſtanding, giuing Chriſt occaſion to ſay vnto him, [g] *Get thee behind mee Satan; for thou vnderſtandeſt not the things that are of God, but the*

[a] Rom. 7. 23.
[b] Gal. 5. 17.
[c] Zephan. 1. 15.
[d] Mat. 13. 16.
[e] Mar. 8. 18.
[f] Mat. 16. 16.
[g] Ibid. ver. 23.

*things*

things that are of men. [h] *Contraria erant adhuc in Petro: There were contraries as yet in Peter*, ſaith *Origen*, *truth and falſhood: he ſpake by truth one way; hee ſpake by falſhood another way.* In a word the Apoſtle telleth vs, that [i] *we knowe but in part, wee prophecie but in part, wee ſee through a glaſſe darkly*, or as the maſters of Rhemes tranſlate it, *in a darke ſort.* How can that bee, but that there is ſtill ſome *darkneſſe* in the vnderſtanding which yet in part hath receiued light? Hee goeth further, *Can there be vertue and vice in the will at the ſame inſtant?* Yes *M. Biſhop*, for whatſoeuer is wanting of perfect vertue, [k] *ex vitio eſt*, ſaith S. *Auſtin*; *it is by reaſon of vice.* So long therefore as there is not perfect vertue, there is *vice* remaining together with *vertue*. The *inner man* wherein is the *will* of man, *is renewed* as the Apoſtleth telleth vs, *from day to day*. *S. Auſtin* verie rightly argueth thereof, [l] *that he that is renewed from day to day, is not yet all renewed*, and therefore *in part he is old ſtill.* Now from what is he renewed but from *vice*, and whereto is hee renewed but to *vertue?* If then the will bee not yet wholy renewed to *vertue*, then *vice* as yet in part remaineth with *vertue* in the will, from whence as yet in part the *will* remaineth to be renewed. Therefore our will carieth vs ſtil contrarie waies; [m] *One way wee will becauſe we are in Chriſt: another way we will becauſe we are ſtill in the world.* Therefore the Apoſtle calling the Corinthians *Saints*, yet anon after telleth them, that *they are carnall and walke like men.* Therefore our Sauiour ſaith to his Diſciples one where, [n] *Yee are cleane by the word that I haue ſpoken vnto you.* Another where he ſaith: [o] *You beeing euill doknowe to giue good gifts to your children.* Yet againe, *Can the ſoule bee truly conuerted to God*, ſaith he, *and as truly auerted from him at one time?* No *M. Biſhop*: but yet in the ſoule conuerted to God, remaineth a part of that infection, wherby [p] Lots wife beeing gone out of Sodome, looked backe to the place from whence ſhe came; ſo that [q] *the children of God albeit they be mooued by the ſpirit of God, and as the children of God doe go forward towards God, yet by their owne ſpirit, as the children of men, through ſome humane motions, they fall backe to themſelues, and thereby commit ſinne.* Therefore they of whom we cannot doubt but that they were *conuerted* vnto God, yet found ſomewhat in themſelues, for which they ſaw that they had cauſe ſtill to pray [r] *to be conuerted.* Againe, *Is Chriſt*, ſaith he, *agreed to dwell with Belial?* Wee anſwer him, No: [s] *there is no agreement betwixt Chriſt and Belial*, and

[h] *Orig. in Matth. tract. 3. Contraria ſibi adhuc erant in Petro, veritas & mendacium. De veritate dicebat, Tu es Chriſtus, &c. Ex mendacio dixit, Propitius tibi eſto, &c.* i 1. Cor. 13. 9. 12.

[k] *Aug. epiſt. 29. Id quod minus eſt quam debet, ex vitio eſt.*

[l] *Aug. de peccat. merit. & remiſſ. lib 2. ca. 7. Qui de die in diem renouatur, nondum totus eſt renouatus, & in quantum nondum eſt renouatus, in tantum adhuc in vetuſtate eſt.*

[m] *Idem in Ioan. tract. 81. Aliud volumus quia ſumus in Chriſto, & aliud volumus quia ſumus adhuc in hoc ſeculo.*

[n] John 15. 3.

[o] Matth. 7. 11.

[p] Gen. 19. 26.

[q] *Aug. Enchirid. ca. 64. Sic ſpiritu Dei excitantur, & tanquam filij Dei proficiunt ad Deum, vt etiam Spiritu ſuo maximè aggrauante corruptibili corpore tanquam filij hominum quibuſdam motibus humanis deficiant ad ſeipſos, & ideo peccent.*

[r] Pſal. 85. 4: Lament. 5. 21.

[s] 2. Cor. 6. 15.

and therefore doth Christ come to dwell in vs, that *Belial* may be dispossessed & driuen out. And therefore [t] *where there is* (by Christ) *forgiuenesse of sinnes, the diuell without doubt is expulsed out of the heart of the sinner.* But yet there remaine still the venemous seedes of his planting, [u] *a necessitie of sinne*, by the aduantage whereof *this tempter fighteth against vs:* [x] *will we, nill we, this Ishmite* for the time *dwelleth within our borders: hee may bee subdued, but he cannot vtterly be destroied.* Last of all, *Is the holy Ghost*, saith he, *content to dwell in a bodie subiect to sinne?* Againe we answer him, No: for [y] *sinne doth not reigne in the bodies* of the faithfull, that they should be subiect vnto it, *in obeying the lusts thereof.* [z] *For so long as they liue, sinne must needs haue a being in them*; it is tempting, it is enticing, it neuer ceaseth vrging and prouoking from day to day: but yet [a] *the kingdome thereof is abolished, because the law of the spirit of life hath freed them from the law* (that is, the kingdome and power) *of sinne and of death.* But if hee meane *subiect to sinne*, of the *liuing of sinne*, then the Apostle telleth him, [b] *I am carnall, sold vnder sinne,* [c] *a captiue vnto the law of sinne that is in my members*, so that [d] *if we say we haue no sinne, we deceiue our selues, and there is no truth in vs.* So then some of his collections wee denie, not being consequents of our doctrine, but his owne vaine and idle amplifications: the rest that are direct to the point wee affirme, as I haue declared, and whatsoeuer his *naturall sconce* conceiueth thereof, the Scripture iustifieth, that *the fault and deformitie of sinne* (though not in former degree) *remaineth in a man renewed and endued with Gods grace.* And what doth he thinke of himselfe I maruell? is he a man renewed and endued with Gods grace? What, and *no fault? no deformitie of sinne remaining in him? no spot? no wrinkle?* Wee wonder that a troupe of Angels commeth not from heauen to applaud him, and to conney him as a great iewell out of the world. But had he grace to know himselfe, he would soone perceiue, that this *fault of sinne* is not *penned vp in an odde corner of him*, but possesseth all his corners, and spreadeth itselfe as an infection ouer the whole man. And surely he that well considereth this booke of his, will bee of opinion, that doubtlesse there is some deformed matter in him, that could yeeld so much absurditie and vntruth as he hath contained therein. As for his *Remember*, he telleth vs that wee shall meete with it againe, and therefore I will reserue it to his due place.

[t] *Bern. in Cantic. Serm. 6. Vbi peccatum remittitur, ibi proculdubio diabolus de corde peccatoris expellitur.* Et *August. contr. Iulian. l. 6. ca. 8. Expulsio demoniorum est remissio peccatorum, &c.*

[u] *Aug. de nat. & grat. ca. 66. Certamen est aduersus tentatorem de ipsa contra nos necessitate pugnantem.*

[x] *Bern. in Cantic. Ser. 58. Velis nolis, intra fines tuos habitat Iebusæus: subiugari potest, sed non exterminari.*

[y] Rom. 6. 12.

[z] *Aug. in Ioann. tract. 41. Quamdiu viuis necesse est esse peccatum in membris tuis.*

[a] Rom. 8. 2.

[b] Rom. 7. 14.

[c] Vers. 23.

[d] 1. Ioh. 1. 8.

2. W.

3. W. BISHOP.

Let vs now come vnto the difference which is betweene vs. The Catholikes teach, that Originall sinne is so farre foorth taken away by baptisme, that it ceaseth to bee a sinne properly: the effects of it remaining, are an imperfection and weakenesse, both in our vnderstanding and will, and a want of that perfect subordination of our inferiour appetite vnto reason, as was, and would haue beene, in Originall iustice: which make the soule apt and ready to fall into sinne, like vnto tinder, which although it be not fire of it selfe, yet is fit to take fire: yet say they, that these reliques of Originall sinne be not sinnes properly, vnlesse a man doe yeeld his consent vnto those euill motions. *Master Perkins teacheth otherwise:* That albeit Originall sinne be taken away in the regenerate in sundry respects, yet doth it remaine in them after Baptisme, not onely as a want and weakenesse, but as a sinne, and that properly, as may be proued by
Rom. 1. 7. these reasons: *S. Paul saith directly,* It is no more I that doe this, but sinne that dwelleth in me, that is, originall sinne. *The Papists answer,* That it is called there, sinne improperly, because it commeth of sinne, and is an occasion of sinne. *I approue this interpretation of S. Paul, as taken out of that ancient and famous Papist* S. Augustine, *who*
Lib. 1. contr. duas epist. Pelag. ca. 10. *saith expresly:* Concupiscence, (*whereof the Apostle speaketh*) although it bee called sinne, yet it is not so called because it is sinne, but for that it is made by sinne: as writing is called the hand, because it is made by the hand. *And in another place repeating the same, addeth:* That it may also be called sinne, for that it is the cause of sin:
Lib. 1. de nuptijs & concup. cap. 23. as cold is called slothfull, because it makes a man slothfull: *so that the most profound Doctor* S. Augustine *is stiled a formall Papist by* M. Perkins, *and shall be as well coursed for it by the plaine circumstances of the place: For, saith he, that S. Paul there takes sinne properly appeares by the words following,* That this sinne dwelling in him, made him to doe the euill which he hated. *How proues this, that sinne there must be taken properly? it rather proues, that it must be taken improperly: for if it made him do the euill which he hated, then could it not be sinne properly: for sinne is not committed, but by the consent and liking of the will. But S. Paul did not like that euill, but hated it, and thereby was so farre off from sinning, that he did a most vertuous deed in resisting and*

*ouercomming*

*ouercomming that euill.* As witnesseth Saint Augustine, *saying*, Reason sometimes resisteth manfully, and ruleth raging concupiscence; which being done, wee sinne not, but for that conflict are to bee crowned. Lib. 1. de Orig. cont. Manich. cap. 14.

*The first circumstance then alleged by* M. Perkins, *doth rather make against him then for him.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins* alleging the words of S. Paul, * *It is no more I that doe it, but sinne that dwelleth in me*, thereby to proue that concupiscence in the regenerate still remaineth the nature of sinne, saith that *the Papists answer, that it is called sinne there improperly, because it commeth of sinne, and is an occasion of sinne. M. Bishop* saith, that *he approueth this interpretation, as taken out of that ancient and famous Papist Saint Austin*, and addeth, *that the most profound Doctor S. Austin, is by Master Perkins stiled a formall Papist.* But he speaketh this out of a weake head and shallow wit, that cannot vnderstand *so profound a Doctor* as *S. Austin* is. What *S. Austins* opinion was as touching this point, we shall examine hereafter in the ninth section, where occasion is more fully offred to speake thereof. In the meane time, that *S. Austin* was no Papist, is plainly shewed in the † African Councell, where were assembled two hundred and seuenteene Bishops of those parts, and *Austin* one of them, to whom *Boniface* the first, then Bishop of Rome, sent his Legates, desirous to haue an oare in their boat, and challenging to himselfe a supremacie ouer their Churches. But they all with one consent (let him remember that *Austin* was one of them) resisted this proud attempt: and whereas the Bishop of Rome alleged and shewed the Nicene Canons yeelding him that supremacie, they smelling his fraud, and perceiuing that hee had falsified and corrupted the Canons, sent as to others, so namely to the Patriarkes of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, for the certaine and vndoubted Copies hereof. Vpon the sight whereof, this peece of knauerie being discouered, they wrote backe first to *Boniface*, and after to *Celestinus*, that they would not admit any such iurisdiction; that they would end their causes within themselues; that they would allow of no appeales to the Bishop of Rome; and wished him, that hee would hereafter forbeare to trouble them

* Rom. 7. 17.

† Concil. Carthag. 4. cap. 10. 105.

them any more with his Legates. Wherein they crossed a speciall point of Poperie, which is the maine prop of all the rest: and this act of theirs was held to be so preiudiciall to the Sea of Rome and authoritie of the Pope, as that [c] *Bonifac* the second affirmed, that *in pride they did that which they did against the Church of Rome, by the instigation of the diuell.* It appeareth then hereby, that *S. Austin* was no Papist, neither was hee so, as shall appeare in that point which we haue heere in hand. In the meane time, against the answer of the Papists, that *sinne* is improperly taken by the Apostle, when he calleth *concupiscence* by the name of *sinne*, *M. Perkins* alledgeth the circumstance of the place, as first *that S. Paul saith, that this sinne dwelling in him; made him doe the euill which he hated.* Where to proceed orderly, and to giue light to his whole disputation, it is first to bee resolued what *concupiscence* is, and what *sinne* is: for very vncertainly shall we argue that *concupiscence* is *sinne*, vnlesse by definition of both we make it appeare how they accord in one. By *concupiscence* therefore we vnderstand the remainder of the originall corruption of nature, after baptisme, in the state of regeneration and new birth. For man by nature is wholy vncleane and sinfull, there is nothing in him but that that is euill, nothing but [d] *enmitie against God.* Whence it is that *Chrysostome* saith, that [e] *man naturally is not onely a sinner, but also wholly sin*, and *loath in him all manner of euill.* Now this corruption which naturally ouerfloweth and drowneth the whole man, by the spirit of regeneration is abated, and the strength thereof broken, but so, as that still there remaineth a grieuous infection of it, which continually crosseth and resisteth the worke of the holy Ghost, and [f] *fighteth against the soule*, by soliciting and enticing it vnto sinne. In this remnant of corruption which we call by the name of *concupiscence* or *lust*, we are to consider both the *habit*, which is the continued euill qualitie, and also the immediate actions, and affections, and motions thereof. For [h] *beside the euill motion, as S. Austin saith, there is within an euill, from whence this motion doth arise.* And this [i] *euill* continueth when there is no act or motion thereof, as when a man is asleepe, and the mind & thought no way stirreth, yet the inward corrupt qualitie sticketh still, euen as a man is truly said to be timorous & fearfull, when yet for the present time he feareth nothing. Now the question heere is of both these so, both the sticking euill qualitie, and the first and immediate

[c] *Bonifac. 2. epist. ad Eulal. Concil. tom. 2. Aurelius Carthaginensis Ecclesiæ olim Episcopus cum collegis suis instigante Diabolo superbire, temporibus prædecessorum nostrorum Bonifacij atque Cœlestini contra Romanam Ecclesiam cœpit.*

[d] Rom. 8. 7.

[e] *Chrysost. op. imperfect. in Matth. homil. 27. Omnis homo, naturaliter non solum peccator est, sed etiam totum peccatum. Idem habet ex variis in Matt. locis homil. 23.*

[f] *Ibid. op. imperf. homil. 24. Homo omnia mala habet in se.*

[g] 1. Pet. 2. 11.

[h] *Aug. contr. Iul. Pelag. lib. 6. ca. 8. Præter istum motum inest homini malum, unde surgit hic motus.*

[i] *Ibid. Sicut inest timiditas homini timido etiam quando non timet.*

mediate motions and ſtirrings thereof, before they be apprehended and conſented vnto by the will. For many times euill cogitations and thoughts ariſe in the heart, which yet a man checketh, and for which he is grieued at himſelfe, and reproueth himſelfe, and by no meanes will yeeld way vnto them. Of theſe therefore, together with the fountaine whence they ſpring, the controuerſie is, whether they doe properly vndergoe the name of ſinne. Now what *ſinne* is, the Apoſtle Saint *Iohn* briefly inſtructeth vs, ſaying, that [k] *ſinne is the tranſgreſſion of the law.* His word is *ἀνομία*, which ſignifieth all *priuation or defect*, whereby wee come ſhort of that that is commanded or required by the Law. To which purpoſe the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* telleth vs, that [l] *by the law is the knowledge of ſinne*, and that [m] *he had not knowne ſinne but by the law.* For how is ſinne knowne by the *law*, but by that wee vnderſtand it to bee ſinne, whatſoeuer declineth or ſwarueth from the law? euen as the Apoſtle for example addeth, that *he had not knowne luſt* to bee ſinne, *except the law had ſaid, Thou ſhalt not luſt*, preſuming it as granted, that it is ſinne whatſoeuer is forbidden by the law. And this the Apoſtle Saint *Iohn* further confirmeth, in that he ſaith, that [n] *all vnrighteouſneſſe is ſinne.* For what is *vnrighteouſneſſe*, but the *tranſgreſſing of the law*, which is the *rule of righteouſneſſe*? If then *all vnrighteouſneſſe be ſinne*, and *all tranſgreſſion* of the law be *vnrighteouſneſs*, then all *tranſgreſſion of the law is ſinne.* The heathen Orator *Tullie* could ſay, that [o] *peccare, to ſinne, is as a man would ſay, to goe without, or beyond the bounds or lines.* Wee are lifted and bounded by the law of God: it draweth vs lines, within the compaſſe whereof we are to keepe our ſelues. What is it then to ſinne with vs, but to breake the bounds preſcribed vnto vs, and to goe beſide that which we are directed by the law? Therefore ſaith *Origen*, [p] *This is the nature of ſinne, if any thing be done, which the law forbiddeth to be done.* *Oecumenius* out of the ancient Commentaries of the Fathers ſaith to the like purpoſe, that [q] *ſinne and tranſgreſſion of the law doe agree together, and that rightly Saint Iohn did make them both one.* So [r] *Gregorie* Biſhop of Rome calling *tranſgreſſion of the law* by the name of *iniquitie*, as the vulgar Latine tranſlateth it, ſaith, that *betwixt ſin and iniquity*, that is, betwixt ſin and the tranſgreſſion of the law, *S. Iohn doth witneſſe that there is no difference.* In like ſort *Beda* ſaith, that [s] *all that ſwarueth from the rule of righteouſneſs is ſin.* *Caſarius* the brother of *Gregory Nazianzene* telleth vs, that [t] *hee taketh*

k 1. Ioh. 3. 4.
l Rom. 3. 20.
m Cap. 7. 7.
n 1. Ioh. 5. 14.
o *Tul. Paradox. 3. Eſt peccare tanquam tranſire lineas.*
p *Orig. in Ro. c. 7. Peccati natura hæc eſt, ſi fiat quod lex fieri vetat.*
q *Oecum. in 1. Ioan. c. 3. Conueniunt inter ſe, & circa idem ſunt. Rectè diſcipulus Domini vtrumque in idem commutauit.*
r *Greg. Moral. lib. 11. cap. 21. Inter peccatum & iniquitatem nihil diſtare perhibet annes, quæ [illegible] peccati [illegible] æquitati [illegible] diſcrepat, in peccati [illegible] numeratur.*
s *Beda [illegible] 3. Omne [illegible] æquitati [illegible]*
t *Caſ. dialog. 3. apud Nazianzen. Peccatum mihi eſſe videtur omnis aduerſus virtutem reſiſtendi conatus & repugnantia.*

*it, that ſinne is all aſſay of reſiſtance, and all repugnancie againſt vertue.* Saint *Auſtine* ſaith, that [u] *therefore a thing is ſinne, becauſe it ought not to be done, and that* [x] *to doe any thing amiſſe, is to ſinne.* Againe hee defineth [y] *ſinne to be euery thing that is ſaid, or done, or coueted againſt the euerlaſting law of God.* Yea *Thomas Aquinas* ſaith, that [z] *to ſinne is nothing elſe but to tranſgreſſe the commandements of God.* In a word, the curſe of God belongeth to nothing ſaue to ſinne onely. But the curſe of God belongeth to euery ſwaruing from the law of God: for [a] *curſed is hee that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the Law to doe them.* Therefore euery ſwarning from the lawe of God is properly and truely reckoned to be ſinne. And ſurely this is a truth ſo apparant and euident, as that we may wonder, not at the blindneſſe, (for vndoubtedly they ſee it well enough) but at the extreame peruerſeneſſe and impudencie of the Papiſts, that ſo ſtiffely ſtand in the deniall thereof. Now then the queſtion being whether *concupiſcence or luſt in it ſelfe be ſinne* in the regenerate man, the reſolution is very readie and plaine, and the anſwere manifeſtly apparant, that becauſe euery diuerting or ſwarning from the lawe is ſinne, therefore concupiſcence muſt neceſſarily be ſinne, in as much as it is a declining from the lawe, ſaying: *Thou ſhalt not luſt.* And therefore doth the Apoſtle ſay, that he *knew luſt* to be ſinne, (as before was noted) becauſe *the law ſaid, Thou ſhalt not luſt.* Hee calleth and termeth it *ſinne* againe and againe, ſo as that wee may wonder, that he ſhould call it *ſinne, ſinne,* and yet his meaning ſhould be, that it is not *ſinne.* For as Tertullian ſaith: [b] *A cuius habitu quid diuertit, pariter & a vocatu eius recedit: Looke from the being and nature whereof a thing departeth, it departeth alſo from the name and calling thereof.* If therefore concupiſcence had loſt the nature of ſinne, it ſhould conſequently alſo bee depriued of the name. But now whereas *M. Perkins* alledged the words of the Apoſtle, *that ſinne dwelling in him, made him to doe the euill which hee hateth, M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that contrary to *M. Perkins* purpoſe and intention, *thoſe words doe proue, that ſinne muſt bee there taken improperly.* And how ſo I pray you? *For* (ſaith he) *if it made him to doe the euil which he hated, then could it not be ſinne properly, for ſinne is not committed but by the conſent and liking of the will.* Where by AEquiuocation of termes, hee meerely abuſeth his Reader. For the *committing of*

*ſinne*

u. *Aug. de nat. & grat. cap. 14. Ideo eſt peccatum quia non debet fieri.*

x *Contra Iulian. lib. 4. cap. 3. Qui male facit aliquid profectò peccat.*

y *Auguſt. cont. Fauſt. Manich. lib. 22. cap. 27. Peccatum eſt factum, vel dictum, vel concupitum, aliquid contra legem æternam.*

z *Thom. Aquin. 1. 2. q. 109. art. 4. in corp. Nihil eſt aliud peccare quã tranſgredi diuina mandata.*

a *Gal. 3. 10.*

b *Tertul. educrſ. Hermogen.*

ſinne is properly vnderſtood of the externall act and accompliſhment thereof; and this indeed cannot bee without the conſent and liking of the will. But *the doing euill* of which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, is no externall act, but onely the internall [c] *motion of concupiſcence*. For we may not vnderſtand the Apoſtles words of *doing the euill which he hated*, and *doing that which hee would not*, [d] *as if hee had ſaid, he would haue beene chaſt, and yet was an adulterer; or would haue beene mercifull, and yet was cruell: or would haue beene godly, and yet was vngodly: or ſuch like: but his meaning is, Volo non concupiſcere, & concupiſco: My will and deſire is to haue no act, no motion of concupiſcence, and yet I haue ſo.* I would not haue ſo much as any cogitation, any affection, any thought, any inclination or paſſion of deſire tending to euill, and yet I cannot preuaile to be without them. Now therefore *M. Biſhop* did amiſſe to breede ambiguity by chaunging of the tearmes, and to put vpon the Apoſtle a ſuſpition of other meaning then indeed he had. But if his meaning bee as it ſhould bee, that no euill can bee done, which may truely bee called a *ſinne*, without the conſent and liking of the will, hee ſaith vntruely, and doth therein but walke in the ſteppes of the Pelagian Heretikes. Saint *Auſtine* anſwered them, and we anſwere him, that [e] *it is ſinne, when either there is not charity, which ought to bee, or it is leſſe then it ought to be, whether it may bee auoyded by the will, or cannot be auoyded*: that is to ſay, whether it bee with the will or againſt the will. And whereas hee had defined ſinne againſt the Manichees to bee [f] *the deſire of retaining or obtaining that which iuſtice forbiddeth, and whence it is in mans liberty to forbeare*, as if there were no ſinne but what the will by it owne liberty doth approue and yeeld vnto, he ſheweth that he there defined, [g] *that which is onely ſinne, and is not alſo the puniſhment of ſinne*. So hauing afterward [h] *that in no ſort is it ſinne which is not voluntary*, he giueth the ſame reſtraint againe, that [i] *that ſinne onely muſt there bee vnderſtood, which is onely ſinne, and is not alſo the puniſhment of ſin*: as thereby ſtill giuing to vnderſtand, that that ſinne which is the puniſhment of ſinne, as is concupiſcence or luſt, is rightly and truly ſo called, though it haue not the conſent and approbation of the will. It was [k] *voluntary one ſt by the will of him*, by whom ſinne was firſt committed, and from him it is become *originall and hereditarie*

c *Auguſt contr. duas Epiſt. Pela. lib. 1. cap. 10. Facere ſe dixit non affectu conſentiendi & implendi, ſed ex ſo motu concupiſcendi.*

d *Idem de verb. Apoſt. Ser. 5. Non ſic intelligamus quod dixit, Non quod volo, &c tanquã velit eſſe caſtus, & eſſe adulter, aut velit eſſe miſericors, & eſſet crudelis, aut velit eſſe pius, & eſſet impius, ſed volo non concupiſcere, et concupiſco. Vide Epiphan. her. 64.*

e *De perfect. iuſtit. Rat. 15. Peccatum eſt, cùm non eſt charitas quæ eſſe debet, vel minor eſt quàm debet, ſiue hoc voluntate vitari poſſit, ſiue non poſſit.*

f *De duab. anim. contr. Manich. cap. 11. See of Free wil ſect. 18*

g *Retract. lib. 1. cap. 15.*

h *De vera reli. cap. 14. Vſque adeo peccatum voluntarium malum eſt, vt nullo modo ſit peccatum, ſi non ſit voluntarium.*

i *Retract. lib. 1. cap. 13. Peccatum illud cogitandum eſt, quod tantùm malo peccatum eſt, non quod eſt etiam pœna peccati.*

k *Ibidem Con abſurdè dicatur etiam voluntarium, quia ex primi ho-*

*minis mala voluntate contractum, factum eſt quod ei modo hereditarium.*

*dictary vnto vs. M. Biſhops* exception therefore is nothing worth, neither doth it let, but that *concupiſcence* being a part of *originall ſinne*, is properly called ſinne in the regenerate, though it bee without *the conſent and liking of the will* He ſaith, that becauſe the Apoſtle hated it, therfore it is no ſin: but we ſay, that therfore the Apoſtle hated it, becauſe it is ſin. For the Apoſtle hated it according to God, neither would he hate any thing but what God hateth. And God hateth nothing in man but ſin: that therfore which the Apoſtle hated in himſelfe was ſin: yea what is it *to do euil, but to ſinne?* The name of *euil* we know, is vſed of annoiances and inconueniences, of croſſes & grieuances, but the *doing of euil* is neuer affirmed but of *ſin*. Now to *luſt*, the Apoſtle telleth vs, is *to do euill. To luſt therfore is to ſinne.* And becauſe the act and motion of *luſting* is *ſinne*, therfore the habit of *concupiſcence or luſt* is *a habit of ſinne* alſo, becauſe the action alwaies hath his nature and denomination from the habit and qualitie from whence it doth proceed. Yet *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that the Apoſtle therein *was ſo farre from ſinning, as that he did a moſt vertuous deed, in reſiſting and ouercomming that euil.* But the Scripture calleth *the reſiſting of that euill,* [1] *the fighting againſt ſinne*, and will *M. Biſhop* ſay, that becauſe we fight againſt it, therfore it is not ſin? See what accord here is. The Scripture ſaith, that it is *ſinne* againſt which we *fight*. *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *we doe a vertuous deed in fighting againſt it*, and therfore it is no *ſin*. As for the place of *S. Auſtin*, it helpeth him nothing at al. *Reaſon ſomtimes manfully bridleth and reſtraineth concupiſcence, being moued or ſtirred: which when it doth, non iubemur in peccatum, wee fall not into ſinne.* Which is not a rule in the regenerate only, but alſo in the vnregenerate, ſo that heathen Moraliſts for the auoiding of *ſins*, [m] haue deliuered it for a precept: [m] *Ratio præſit, appetitus obtemperet: Let reaſon rule, and let luſt obey.* Yea that moraliſme which *S. Auſtin* proſecuteth in the place alleged, comparing pleaſure or temptation to the tempting ſerpent, concupiſcence to *Eue* the woman, and reaſon to *Adam* the man, was borrowed from the allegories of [n] *Philo* the Iew, who would thereby ſhew, that concupiſcence ſhould bee kept in from being tempted, and though by temptation it were ſeduced, yet that reaſon ſhould ſubdue it, that it might not runne to any further euill, as it deſireth to doe. Now when this is done by an vnregenerate man, and either a Iew or a heathen man bridle his paſſions and affections, that thereby hee fall not into ſinne,

[1] Heb. 12. 4.

[m] *Tul. Offic. l. 1.*

[n] *Philo. Iud. Allegor. legis, l. 1. & 2.*

will

will *M. Biſhop* conclude hereof, that thoſe paſſions and affections which he bridleth are no ſinne? Hee will not deny the ſame to be *ſinne* in the vnregenerate man, and yet *S. Auſtines* words ſo farre-foorth do indifferently concerne both. He vnderſtandeth *ſinne* morally onely, and as it is reputed with men, who account no ſinne at all, but either in the performance of the act, or in the reſolution and purpoſe of the will. *We fall not into ſinne*, that is, into any morall or actuall ſinne, into any outward ſinne, euen in the like ſort as *S. Iames* ſaith, that [o] *concupiſcence when it hath conceiued, bringeth foorth ſin*, when yet he did not meane, but that concupiſcence alſo it ſelfe is *ſinne*, as ſhall afterwards appeare. [o] Jam. 1. 15.

## 3. W. BISHOP.

*Now to the ſecond.* O wretched man that I am who ſhall deliuer me from this body of death? *Here is no mention of ſinne: how this may be drawne to his purpoſe, ſhall be examined in his argument where he repeateth it: ſo that there is not one poore circumſtance of the text which he can find, to proue S. Paule to take ſin there properly. Now I will proue by diuers, that he ſpeakes of ſinne improperly.*

*Firſt by the former part of the ſame ſentence.* It is not I that do it, *all ſinne is done and committed properly by the perſon in whome it is: but this was not done by* S. Paul. *ergo.*

*Secondly out of thoſe words:* I know there is not in mee, that is in my fleſh, any good: *And after:* I ſee another law in my members, reſiſting the law of my mind. *Thus ſinne properly taken, is ſeated in the ſoule: but that was ſeated in the fleſh, ergo it was no ſinne properly.*

*The third and laſt is taken out of the firſt words of the next Chapter:* There is now therefore no condemnation *to them that are in* Chriſt Ieſus, that walke not according to the fleſh, &c. *Whence I thus argue: there is no condemnation to them, that haue that ſinne dwelling in them, if they walke not according vnto the fleſhly deſires of it: therefore it is no ſinne properly:* For the wages of ſinne is death, *that is, eternall damnation.*

## R. ABBOT.

*Now to the ſecond*, ſaith he, and when hee hath done, ſaith nothing of it, but putteth it ouer to the handling of the argument, and there-

fore there will we alſo examine his examination. But though he ſhift off the one circumſtance with ignorance, and the other with ſaying nothing, yet as if he had very effectually done what he pretendeth, he inferreth, that *not one poore circumſtance of the text could be found to proue, that S. Paule tooke ſinne there properly, marry hee will bring vs diuers, to proue that he taketh ſin improperly.* Wel then, let vs ſee what theſe diuers proofes be: wee doubt they are like his anſwers; the one very bad and the other ſtarke naught. *Firſt hee will proue it by the former part of the ſentence, It is not I that doe it. All ſinne* (ſaith he) *is committed properly by the perſon in whom it is: but this was not done by S. Paule, ergo.* But we deny his *minor* propoſition, and it is altogether abſurd and ſenſleſſe. How ſhould concupiſcence doe any thing in S. *Paule*, which is not done by *S. Paule*? Can the accident of the perſon be an efficient cauſe of any thing by it ſelfe without the perſon? The accident is but the inſtrument of the perſon, and what the accident doth, the perſon doth it by the accident. And therefore accordingly S. *Paule* ſaith, [a] *I am carnall ſold vnder ſinne: I do that I would not: the law of my members leadeth me captiue to the law of ſinne: I in my fleſh ſerue the law of ſinne:* αὐτὸς ἐγὼ; *euen I my ſelfe in my mind ſerue the law of God, and in my fleſh the law of ſinne.* This *S. Auſtine* well obſerued: [b] *Euen in that part that luſteth, it is I alſo: for here is not one I in the mind, and another in the fleſh. Why doth he ſay, I my ſelfe, but becauſe it is I in the mind, and I in the fleſh, euen one man of both theſe. Therefore I my ſelfe, euen I my ſelfe in mind ſerue the law of God: but in my fleſh the law of ſinne.* But yet though being but one and the ſame perſon, he diuideth him ſelfe as it were into two parts, being in part renewed, and in part yet continuing olde. And hereupon he ſaith, *It is not I that doe it*, that is, not I according to that that is renewed in me: and yet I according to that whereby I am ſtill *carnall and ſold vnder ſin: not I* according to the *inner man, wherein I delight in the law of God*, and yet I *according to the fleſh* whereby *I am ſtill captiue to the law of ſinne*: of which *fleſh* I ſay *not I*, becauſe I account *my ſelfe* that that I ioy to bee, and which I ſhall euer be, not that which though it be my ſelfe, yet is that I would not bee, and which I labour not to bee, and therefore ſtriue to deſtroy and put off as being without it to liue for euer. [c] *I may rather ſay, I, in that wherein I rule, then in that wherein I am ouerruled;* therefore I ſay, *it is not I that doe it*, and yet it is I in both. *M. Biſhop* therefore

[a] Rom. 7. 14. 23.

[b] *Auguſt. de verb. Apoſt. Ser. 5 Adhuc concupiſco, & vtique etiam in ipſa parte ego ſum. Non enim ego alius in mente et alius in carne. Sed quid igitur ipſe ego? Quia ego in mente, ego in carne: ex vtroque vnus homo. Igitur ipſe ego, ego ipſe mente ſeruio &c.*

[c] *Ibid. Mens regit caro regitur. & magis ſum ego in eo quo rego, quàm in eo in quo regor.*

therefore by his firſt circumſtance proueth iuſt nothing, and euen as little proueth he by the ſecond. Which he taketh out of thoſe words, [d] *I know that in me, that is, in my fleſh dwelleth no good thing: and after, I ſee another law in my members reſiſting the law of my mind.* Here of he argueth thus: *Sinne properly taken is ſeated in the ſoule, but that was ſeated in the fleſh, ergo it was not ſinne properly.* Which is the ſame as if a man would argue thus, that the true Pope hath his conſiſtorie chaire in Rome, but the Pope that now is hath his conſiſtorie in the Laterance Church, therefore he that now is, is not the true Pope. For what is *fleſh* as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh thereof, but a part of the ſoule; the ſoule it ſelfe, ſo farre as yet in part it is not regenerate? What, is *M Biſhop* ſo abſurd, as to thinke *concupiſcence* to be ſeated in the *fleſh*, as the *fleſh* is diuided againſt the *ſoule*? Nay, the *ſoule* it ſelfe hauing caſt off the yoke of obedience to God, and betraied it ſelfe to the temptations of the diuel for the gratifying and pleaſing of the fleſh, is become a ſeruant to that that ſhould haue bene a ſeruant vnto it, and being abiected to ſenſuall, and carnall, and earthly deſires, is wholy called by the name of *fleſh*, to whoſe ſeruice it doth addict it ſelfe. Thus ſaith *Origen*, that [e] *the ſoule being become of more groſſe diſpoſition, by yeelding it ſelf to the paſſions of the bodie, is ſaid to be become fleſh, and taketh the name of that on which it beſtoweth it moſt deſire.* And againe: [f] *Animas noſtras incarnauimus: We haue turned our ſoules into fleſh.* So ſaith *Auſtine*, that [g] *the Scripture called man himſelfe, that is, the nature of man by the name of fleſh: and called thoſe the workes of the fleſh, which yet are the proper vices of the mind, and belong not to that which* we properly call *the fleſh*. And ſo doth God himſelfe ſay of man wholly, that [h] *he is fleſh*, and our Sauiour in the Goſpell oppoſing *fleſh to the ſpirit*, [i] *That which is borne of the fleſh, is fleſh; and that that is borne of the ſpirit, is ſpirit*, giueth to vnderſtand, that all goeth vnder the name of *fleſh*, that is not borne againe and renewed by the *ſpirit*. Now therefore as touching *concupiſcence*, Saint *Auſtine* telleth vs that [k] *it is ſaid that the fleſh luſteth, becauſe that the ſoule luſteth according to the fleſh.* Yea *Cyprian* doubted not to ſay, [l] *that he held it to be vnproperly ſaid, that the fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit, becauſe it is*

d ver. 18.

e *Origen de principiis lib. 3. cap. 4. Anima cum craſſioris ſenſus fuerit effecta ex eo quod corporis paſſionibus ſe ſubdat, &c. caro dicitur effecta, & inde nomen trahit, in quo plus ſtudij vel propoſiti gerit.*

f *Idem in Pſal. 38. hom. 2.*

g *Auguſt. de ciuit. Dei. lib. 14. cap. 2. Sæpe ipſum hominem, id eſt, naturam hominis carnem nuncupat. Et poſt: In operibus carnis inuenimus illa quibus animi vitia ſignificantur à voluptate carnis aliena.*

h Geneſ. 6. 3.

i Ioh. 3. 6.

k *Aug. de perf. Iuſtit. Rat. 17 & contr. Iulian. lib. 5 cap. 5. Quia carnaliter anima concupiſcit.*

l *Cyprian. in Prolog. de cardinal. Chriſti operibus. Quod caro aduerſ. ſpiritum & ſpiritus aduerſus carnem contendere dicitur, & repugnare impropriè dictum arbitror, quia ſolius animæ hæc iſta eſt quæ ſectum rixatur &c. Et paulo*

*prius Corpore ſic vtitur anima, ſicut Faber malleo vel incude in qua format, omnium turpium idola, & fabricatur qualibet quarumcunque voluptatum ſimulachra. Non eſt caro actiatrix peccati, nec inuentrix malitiæ, nec cogitatus format, nec diſponit agenda, ſed officina eſt ſpiritus, quia in ea & per eam quæcunque affectauerit, peragit, & conſummat.*

*the ſoule onely that is at ſtrife with it ſelfe. For the fleſh is no directer of ſinne, no deuiſer of wickednesſe: it frameth not the thought, nor diſpoſeth what ſhall be done, but is as the ſhop or workhouſe of the ſoule, which in it and by it performeth whatſoeuer it deſireth: vſing the body as the Smith doth his hammer or anuile, framing thereupon the idols of vncleanesſe and pleaſure.* Seeing therefore, as here it is plaine, *concupiſcence* is ſeated in the *ſoule*, which for the corruption thereof is called by the name of *fleſh*, ſo that the Apoſtle by *fleſh* in himſelf meaneth nothing but the *ſoule* according to the remainder *of originall* infection, which ſtill did ſticke faſt vnto him, *M. Biſhop* by his ſecond circumſtance proueth nothing but that concupiſcence is truly & properly affirmed to be *ſin*. Which had bene very readily tohaue bene perceiued by any man, if he had framed his argument as he ſhould haue done: *Sinne properly taken is ſeated in the ſoule; but concupiſcence is not ſeated in the ſoule*: for this euery man would haue preſently ſeene to be abſurd. But he to blind his Reader choſe rather to ſay, *Concupiſcence is ſeated in the fleſh*, whereas notwithſtanding *the fleſh* as it is the ſeate of *concupiſcence* cannot haue any reaſonable vnderſtanding but of the *ſoule*. But now the third circumſtance I trow will do the deed. That he taketh out of the firſt verſe of the eight Chapter. *Now there is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Ieſus, that walke not after the fleſh. Whence*, ſaith he, *I argue thus: There is no condēnation to them that haue ſinne dwelling in them, if they walk not according to the fleſhly deſires of it; therefore it is no ſinne properly: for the wages of ſinne is death, that is eternall damnation.* As if he ſhould ſay, God for Chriſts ſake doth not impute this ſinne, therefore it is no ſinne. God to them that are in Chriſt doth pardon this *ſinne, ergo*, it is not properly *ſinne*. And ſo he might likewiſe argue of *Dauids* adulterie, *Peters* denying & abiuring of his maiſter, *Pauls* perſecuting of the Church that none of theſe were properly *ſins*, becauſe to thē being in Chriſt, there is no condemnatiō for any of theſe things. Such drunken ſophiſtrie are we troubled with, and drawne by the importunity of ignorant buzzards to ſpend time in the refuting of ſuch arguments as rather deſerue to be chaſtened with a whip, then to be graced with an anſwer. The matter is plaine to thē that are willing to vnderſtand. There is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus: it is true: and yet who is there of them that are in Chriſt Ieſus, but confeſſeth vnto God, that there is that

In

in him for which hee might iuſtly bee condemned? To them that are in Chriſt, for Chriſts ſake it is forgiuen and pardoned: it is not imputed vnto them: but it is ſtill ſuch, as if it were imputed, it ſhould be ſufficient to condemne them to euerlaſting death. Therfore the Apoſtle ſaith of concupiſcence, not for his conſenting to it, which he diſclaimeth, but for the hauing of it dwelling in him, that [m] *it ſlue him*, that (*n*) *by the commandement it wrought death in him*, that by it he had [o] *a body of death*. How ſo, but that knowing that *the wages of ſinne is death*, hee knew himſelfe thereby in caſe of death, if God ſhould deale with him for it as in extremitie, and yet in iuſtice he might do. Therefore doth S. *Auſtin* ſay, that euen in the regenerate [p] *concupiſcence is ſuch and ſo great an euill as that only becauſe it is in them, it ſhould hold them in death, and draw them to euerlaſting death, but that the bond of the guilt thereof is looſed in Baptiſme by the forgiueneſſe of all our ſinnes.* It is therefore ſuch in it ſelfe to which death is due, but yet to them that are in Chriſt it proueth not vnto death, becauſe it is forgiuen vnto them for Chriſts ſake. Thus wee haue ſeene an end of *M. Biſhops* circumſtances, and nothing yet to proue, but that concupiſcence by the Apoſtle is properly called ſinne. And to proue that it is ſo, becauſe he ſaith *there is not one poore circumſtance* to that purpoſe, I would haue him to examine theſe. Firſt, that *by the law* the Apoſtle ſaith, *hee knew concupiſcence to bee ſinne*. For it is *ſin* properly whatſoeuer by the law is conuicted to be *ſinne*. Secondly, that *it wrought death vnto him*: and nothing but ſinne could make him to find himſelfe thereby in caſe of death. Thirdly that he ſaith, *ſinne, that it might appeare ſinne, wrought death in mee*, thereby affirming, that *by working death* it did *appeare* to be that indeed which in name it is called, as *Oecumenius* expreſſeth thoſe words, [q] *that all in all it might be made manifeſt to be that that it is*. Fourthly hee ſaith, that [r] *this ſin was exceedingly a ſinner by the cõmandemẽt*: for ſo the words are according to the originall, and ſo ſaith *Irenæus*, by alluſion to that place, that [ſ] *the law did teſtifie of ſinne that it was a ſinner*. Now *ſinne* is not a perſon itſelfe, that it ſhould bee ſaid to bee a *ſinner*, but hereby is ſignified what man is by this *ſinne*, namely of *concupiſcence*; and that is, *exceedingly a ſinner*. But a man cannot be *a ſinner*, but by that that is properly *ſinne*: therefore concupiſcence making a man *a ſinner* by the firſt motions thereof, euen without conſent,

m Rom. 7. 11.
n Verſ. 13.
o Verſ. 24.

p *Auguſt. cont. Iulian. lib. 6. cap. 5 Tale ac tam magnum malum tantum quia ineſt quomodo non teneret in morte & pertraheret in vltimam mortem, niſi & vinculum eius in ea quæ eſt in Baptiſmo peccatorem omnium remiſſione ſolueretur.*

q *Oecumen. in Rom. cap. 7. vt quod eſt totum in toto fiat manifeſtum.*

r κατ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς.

ſ *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 20. Lex teſtificans de peccato quoniam peccator eſt.*

conſent, is properly *a ſinne*. And thus much for circumſtances of the place.

### 4. W. Bishop.

*Now to* M. Perkins *Argument in forme as hee propoſeth it.* That which was once ſinne properly, and ſtill remaining in man, maketh him to ſinne, and intangleth him in the puniſhment of ſinne, and makes him miſerable, that is ſinne properly: But Originall ſinne doth all theſe. *Ergo.*

*The* Maior, *which (as the learned know) ſhould conſiſt of three words containes foure ſeuerall points, and which is worſt of all, not one of them true.*

*To the firſt; that which remaineth in man after Baptiſme, commonly called Concupiſcence, was neuer a ſinne properly: but onely the materiall part of ſinne, the formall and principall part of it, conſiſting in the deprination of Originall iuſtice, and a voluntary auerſion from the law of God, the which is cured by the Grace of God, giuen to the baptized, and ſo that which was principall in Originall ſinne, doth not remaine in the regenerate: neither doth that which remaineth, make the perſon to ſinne, (which was the ſecond point,) vnleſſe he willingly conſent vnto it, as hath bene proued heretofore: it allureth and intiſeth him to ſinne, but hath not power to conſtraine him to it, as* M. Perkins *alſo himſelfe before confeſſed. Now to the third,* and intangleth him in the puniſhment of ſinne: *how doth Originall ſinne intangle the regenerate in the puniſhment of ſinne, if all the guiltineſſe of it bee remoued from his perſon, as you taught before in our Conſent?* Mendacem memorem eſſe oportet: *Either confeſſe that the guilt of Originall ſinne is not taken away from the regenerate, or elſe you may vnſay this, that it intangleth him in the puniſhment of ſinne. Now to the laſt clauſe, that the reliques of Originall ſinne make a man miſerable, a man may bee called wretched and miſerable, in that he is in diſgrace with God, and ſo ſubiect to his heauie diſpleaſure: & that which maketh him miſerable in this ſence, is ſinne: but* S. Paul *taketh not the word ſo here, but for an vnhappy man expoſed to the danger of ſinne, and to all the miſeries of this world, from which we ſhould haue bene exempted, had it not beene for Originall ſinne,*

1. Cor. 15. *after which ſort he vſeth the ſame word.* If in this life onely we were hoping in Chriſt, we were more miſerable then all men: *not that the*

*the good Chriſtians were fartheſt out of Gods fauour, and more ſinfull then other men: but that they had feweſt wordly comforts, and the greateſt croſſes. And thus much in confutation of that formal argument.*

R. ABBOT.

*M Perkins* his propoſition conſiſteth of foure points. *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *of theſe foure points there is not one true.* Which if it be ſo, it was *M. Perkins* good hap to light vpon ſuch an aduerſarie, as of foure ſeuerall points, all as hee ſaith vntrue, is not able to diſproue one. The firſt point is, that *Concupiſcence was once properly ſinne*, which *M. Perkins* preſumed as agreed and granted, becauſe the queſtion betwixt vs and them, is of *Concupiſcence after baptiſme*, as if in the vnbaptiſed there were no queſtion but that concupiſcence is *ſinne*. But *M. Biſhop* here altereth the ſtate of the queſtion, telling vs that *Concupiſcence* was neuer properly *ſinne*, and thereby ſhewing that hee doth but colorably alledge and merely abuſe S. *Auſtin*, who before Baptiſme in no ſenſe denieth but that *Concupiſcence* is truly *ſinne*, and continually affirmeth it to be ſo. And thus he maketh the Apoſtle wholy to dally in naming *ſinne, ſinne*, where there is no *ſinne* indeed, neither after Baptiſme, nor before. But that which hath beene ſayd both of the nature of *ſinne*, and of the circumſtances of the Apoſtles text, to proue that *concupiſcence* after baptiſme is *ſinne*, doth much more proue, that the ſame is *ſinne* before Baptiſme, and it ſhall yet further appeare, if God will, in that that followeth. In the meane time here we are to obſerue, how *M. Biſhop* falſly charging *M. Perkins* with foure vntruths in his argument, in declaring the firſt of thoſe foure, doth himſelfe deliuer foure vntruths indeed. *Concupiſcence*, ſaith he, *was neuer properly ſinne, but onely the materiall part of ſinne: the formall and principall part of it conſiſting in the depriuation of Originall iuſtice, and a voluntary auerſion from the law of God.* Where firſt hee erreth, in that he maketh *Originall iuſtice* to conſiſt onely in the integritie of the *will*, and the forme of *ſinne* to ſtand onely in the *auerſion of the will from God*, by the loſſe of the ſame *Originall iuſtice*, whereas *Originall iuſtice* was in truth the integritie of all the parts of man, not ſubiecting the *fleſh* to the *mind*, and *the mind to God*, but the whole man to God, the image whereof is ſet forth vnto vs in the

comman-

commandement, [a] *Thou ſhalt loue the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, with all thy ſoule, with all thy thought and ſtrength.* The forme of ſinne therefore is not onely in the auerſion of the will, but in the auerſion of any part, or power, or faculty of the ſoule: if in any of theſe there bee a declining from the law of God, it is the ſinne of man. Now becauſe (b) *ſo long as there is any matter of concupiſcence to bee yet bridled and reſtrained, God cannot be loued with all the ſoule* (for how can God haue all the ſoule, ſo long as concupiſcence hath any part?) therefore in the remainder of any matter of concupiſcence, there is *ſinne*; becauſe [c] *it is ſinne when either there is not loue at all, or it is leſſe then it ſhould be*, and it is leſſe then it ſhould be, when it is not *with all the ſoule*. Therefore doth S. *Auſtin* define ſinne to be [d] *hominis inordinatio atque peruerſitas: a diſordered and peruerted condition of man.* Of man he ſaith, not only of the *will* of man, and therefore if in man there bee any diſordered, or miſ-conditioned affection, the ſame is ſinne. But concupiſcence which is a rebellion of the law that is in the members, againſt the law of the mind, is a diſorder in man, and therefore neceſſarily muſt be holden to be truely ſinne. A ſecond errour he committeth, in that making *concupiſcence* onely the materiall part of ſinne, hee appropriateth it to the inferiour, ſenſuall and brutiſh parts and faculties of the nature of man, and to the reſiſtance thereof againſt the ſuperiour and more excellent powers of the will, and reaſon, and vnderſtanding, whereas *concupiſcence* truely vnderſtood importeth the vniuerſall habite of auerſion from God, and a corruption ſpred ouer the whole man, and defiling him in all parts and powers both of body and ſoule. And therefore doth the Apoſtle expound *the conuerſation in or according to the luſts or concupiſcences of the fleſh*, to be [e] *the fulfilling of the will of the fleſh and of the minde*, which hee could not doe, but that *concupiſcence* ſignifieth alſo the prauitie and corruption of the mind, euen as the Apoſtle S. *Peter* alſo maketh it the fountaine of all [f] *the corruption that raigneth in the world.* And this amongſt *the workes of the fleſh*, which are the fruits and effects, and as it were the ſtreame of that fountaine of corruption, are reckoned thoſe things which haue their proper ſeate and being in the higheſt parts of the ſoule, as are [g] *idolatrie, hereſie, witchcraft, enuie, hatred, pride*, which being acts of *concupiſcence* and ſinfull luſt, yet are ſo farre [h] from being tied to the

a Mat. 22. 30. Luk. 10. 27.

b *Auguſt. de perfect. iuſtit. Rat. 17. Cùm eſt aliquid concupiſcentiæ carnalis quod vel continendo frænetur non omnimodo ex tota anima diligitur Deus.*

c *Ibid. Rat. 15.*

d *Ad Simplic. quæſt. 2. Eſt peccatum hominis inordinatio atq; peruerſitas; id eſt à præſtantiore conditore auerſio & ad condita inferiora conuerſio.*

e Epheſ. 2. 3.

f 2 Pet. 1. 4.

g Gal. 5. 20. 21.

h *Auguſt. de ciu. Dei lib. 14. cap. 2. & 3.*

the inferiour parts of the ſoule, which haue their occupation properly in the fleſh, as that ſome of them, and that ſpecially *pride and enuie*, are noted to bee the ſinnes of the Diuell, who hath no communion or ſocietie with the *fleſh*, and therefore in the name and nature of *concupiſcences*, are meerely the vices and corruptions of the minde. Yea *S. Auſtin* acknowledgeth, that [i] *concupiſcence is nothing elſe but the will of man corrupted and ſeruing ſinne*, and that *the temptation of concupiſcence* is nothing elſe but [k] *the temptation of a mans owne euill will*. So ſaith *S. Bernard*. [l] *It is in my will that I continue to doe againſt the law of God, for mine owne will is the law in my members rebelling againſt the law of God; mine owne will is found contrarie to my ſelfe*. Whereby it appeareth, that *concupiſcence* which is *that rebelling law of ſinne*, is a deprauation of the *will* alſo, and not to be reſtrained to the brutiſh and ſenſuall affections of the inferiour part. Nay *Hierome* noteth, that it ſignifieth [m] *all the paſſions or perturbations of the ſoule, whereby wee ioy or ſorrow, feare or deſire*, which are holden to be [n] *the originals and beginnings of all ſinnes and vices*, which although Poets and Philoſophers haue taken to ariſe of the *fleſh*, yet [o] *Chriſtian faith*, ſaith *Auſtin*, *teacheth otherwiſe, that we are not to attribute theſe vices of euill life altogether to the fleſh*, that is, to the ſenſuall part, *leſt that of all the ſinnes thereof wee acquit the diuell, becauſe hee is without fleſh*. Another errour of his is, that hee maketh the *priuation of Originall iuſtice, and auerſion of the will* to be the *principall* matter of *Originall ſinne*. For the *principall* matter in *Originall ſinne*, is the [p] *guilt of Adams ſinne*, [q] *in whom wee all haue ſinned, and in him haue all receiued the ſentence of damnation*. For that muſt bee accounted the *principall*, which is the cauſe of all the reſt; and it is the guilt of the firſt ſinne, that is the cauſe of whatſoeuer further ſinne originally cleaueth to vs, which together with death it ſelfe is the puniſhment of that firſt ſinne. His fourth errour is as touching the *cure of Originall ſinne*, which hee maketh to bee ſuch, as if *Originall iuſtice* were wholly reſtored, and all *auerſion of the will from God* wholly taken away. Which is ſo palpably falſe, as that wee may wonder that hee had ſo little feeling of conſcience, as that for ſhame hee would write it to the world. For if there bee that

i *Idem. Retract. li. 1. c. 15. Ipſa cupiditas nihil aliud eſt quàm voluntas, ſed vi ſolâ peccato ſeruiens.*

k *De bono perſeuer. ca. 6. Qui intentationem ſuæ malæ voluntatis non infertur, in nullam prorſus infertur. Vnuſquiſque enim tentatur à concupiſcentia ſua, &c.*

l *Bernar. in Cant. Serm. 81. Voluntate perſiſto agere contra legem. Nam mea voluntas ipſa eſt lex in membris meis, legi diuinæ recalcitrans. Mihi ipſi mea ipſius voluntas contraria inuenitur.*

m *Hier. ad Algaſ. quæſt. 8. Nos per concupiſcentiam omnes perturbationes animæ ſignificatas putamus, quibus mœremus, & gaudemus, timemus & concupiſcimus.*

n *Aug. de Ciuit. Dei. lib. 14. cap. 3. Originis omnium peccatorum atque vitiorum.*

o *Ibid. Non omnia vitæ inuncta vitia tribuenda ſunt carni, ne ab his*

*omnibus purgemur diabolum qui non habet carnem.* p *2 Retract. lib. 1. cap. 15. Peccatum eis dicimus ex Adam originaliter trahere, id eſt eius reatu implicatos, & ob hoc pœnæ obnoxios detineri.* q *Bernard in aduent. Dom. Serm. 1. In Adam omnes peccauimus, & in illo ſententiam damnationis accepimus omnes.*

cure

cure that he speaketh of in the Baptized, how is it that there is so little effect or token thereof? How is it that after Baptisme there remaineth so great crookednesse & peruersenesse of nature, which we find commonly to bee no lesse then from the beginning men haue complained of? How is it that it is r *so rare and hard a matter to be trained to goodnes*; *so easie & ready a matter to become naught*? that to the one we straine with much difficulty, albeit we vse all the good helps therto that may be vsed; the other is so familiar to vs, as that without any teacher, without any example to instruct vs, wee can learne it of our selues? Why doth he vtter these absurd paradoxes so contrarie to the common sense and experience of all men? It is true that in Baptisme there is a medicine applied for the curing of this Originall maladie, which medicine taketh effect according to the purpose of the grace of God. It doth not by and by worke in all: it worketh in some sooner, in some later, as he thinketh good to giue it effect, by whom it was first applied. Sometimes after many yeares he maketh the same worke full by his effectuall calling, which from infancy hath lien as it were fruitlesse, as if it neuer had bene done. But when it doth worke, it worketh not all at once; it worketh but by degrees; it hath still somewhat s *to renew from day to day*, and neuer effecteth a full and perfect cure so long as we liue heere. This followeth afterward to bee prooued at large, and therefore I will but briefly propound it in this place. Now all these fancies hath *M. Bishop* vttered in answering the first point of *M. Perkins* his argument. Let vs now come to the second point. *M. Perkins* saith, that *concupiscence maketh a man to sinne*, *M. Bishop* saith, it doth not *make a man to sinne vnlesse hee consent vnto it*. But the Apostle telleth vs that *concupiscence* doth make a man *to doe euill*: and it hath beene shewed that that *euill is sin*, euen before there be giuen any consent vnto it. This *euill* consisteth in *euil motions and thoughts*, t *which arise in vs whether we will or not*, neither u *are our harts and thoughts in our owne power* for the auoiding thereof, but that *euen vnawares they ouercast the mind, and throw it downe to the earth whilest it is tending towards heauen, & that runneth in the fancy which we make speciall labour to put out*. Yea oftentimes they grow to that absurditie and wickednesse, as that we could not beleeue but vpon our owne experience, that there were in vs so corrupt a spring, as to yeeld so loathsome and filthy streames; which

make

r *Cyprian de Cardinal. Christi operib. in Prologo. Omnino rarum est & difficile pertinere ad bonum: facile & promptum esse ad malum, & hæc sine magistro sine exemplo doctrina sponte à pubescentibus annis imbuimur & docemur.*

s 2. Cor. 4. 16.

t *Epiphan. hær. 64 Origen. Obrepunt circa cor nostrum etiam non volentibus nobis, &c.*

u *Ambr. de fuga seculi. l. b. 1. ca. 1. Non in potestate nostra est cor nostrum & nostræ cogitationes quæ à prouisio offusa mentem animumque confundunt atque aliò trahit quàm tu proposueras, &c. Ipso in tempore quo eligere mentè paramus, insertus inanibus cogitationibus ad terrena plerunque deijcimur. Et paulo post: vt quod studeas vitare, hoc cogites animoque voluas.*

make the true faithfull man aſhamed of himſelfe, and to condemne himſelfe in the ſight of God, howſoeuer nothing thereof appeare to the eyes of men. But with *M. Biſhop* theſe things are nothing; he will neuer cry God mercie for any ſuch, becauſe he hath therein done him no treſpaſſe; yea the Trent Councell telleth vs, that herein is [x] *nothing that God hateth, nothing that hindereth vs from entring into heauen*. Which ſeeing God requireth *all the thoughts* to be beſtowed in his loue, and thereby denounceth it to be a ſinne to haue any of our *thoughts* wandring away from him, theſe men would neuer thus affirme and teach, but that [y] *a ſpirit of ſlumber* hath cloſed their eyes, that they ſee not that truth, againſt which they haue reſolued to beate themſelues. The third point of *M. Perkins* argument is, that *concupiſcence intangleth a man in the puniſhment of ſinne*. This *M. Biſhop* ſaith, is contrarie to that that he had ſayd before, that *the guilt of Originall ſinne is taken away in the regenerate*. But here is no contrarietie, becauſe in the continuall rebellion of *concupiſcence*, a mans conſcience feeth puniſhment, thereby due vnto him if God ſhould require the ſame, but yet by faith comforteth himſelfe, that it is remitted vnto him for Chriſts ſake. And that which *M. Perkins* ſpake, he ſpake it out of the Apoſtles words, who of concupiſcence ſaith, that [z] *it wrought death in him*, that is, made him in himſelfe guiltie of death, and thus intangled him in the puniſhment of *ſinne*, although in Chriſt he ſaw deliuerance, becauſe [a] *there is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Ieſus*. Let *M. Biſhop* therefore diſcharge *M. Perkins* of the lie, and take the whetſtone to himſelfe, as being farre more iuſtly due vnto him. The laſt point of the argument is, that *concupiſcence maketh a man miſerable*, taken out of the words of the Apoſtle, [b] *Wretched man, or miſerable man that I am, who ſhall deliuer me from the bodie of this death*, or *from this body of death? M. Biſhop* hereto anſwereth, that *miſerable* is vnderſtood two maner of waies, either by being in diſgrace with God, or by reaſon of the danger of ſinne, and the miſeries of this world. But of the danger of ſinne the Apoſtle acquitteth himſelfe, [c] *The Lord will deliuer me from euery euill worke, and will preſerue me vnto his heauenly kingdome*, and [d] *neither things preſent, nor things to come ſhall ſeparate vs from the loue of God*. As for the miſeries of this world, they are here drawne in by head and ſhoulders, there being here no ſhew of any

x Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 5. *In renatis nihil odit Deus; nihil eos ab ingreſſu cœli cõmoratur.*

y Rom. 11. 8.

z Rom. 7. 13.

a Cap. 8. 1.

b Rom. 7. 24.

c 2. Tim. 4. 18.

d Rom. 8. 39.

matter

matter that ſhould mooue the Apoſtle thus to complaine in reſpect thereof. But the thing is plaine, that he calleth himſelfe *miſerable*, as *S. Auſtin* plainely teacheth, by reaſon of [e] *an* inward *euill qualitie whereby the will being good, could not anaile* to doe the good that hee would. He calleth himſelfe *miſerable*, by reaſon of that from which he deſired to be deliuered, which is *the body of death*. Now *the body of death* is that which before he hath called [f] *the bodie of ſinne*, and elſewhere [g] *the body of the ſinnes of the fleſh*. By *the body of ſinne* is vnderſtood *concupiſcence*, which is as a body conſiſting of many members and parts, which are the diuers luſts of diuers ſinnes, and thereby is *a body of ſinnes*, euen conſiſting of all maner of ſinnes. For wee may not heere vnderſtand *the body* properly, as of the bodie which dieth, as if the Apoſtle had deſired a diſſolution and end of life, becauſe [h] *euery one that dieth is not thereby deliuered from the body of death*. For [i] *the death of the body ſeparateth (the wicked) from the body, when yet the vices and ſins thereby gathered do ſticke faſt, to which iuſt puniſhment remaineth due*. Therfore when he praieth to be deliuered *from this body of death*, [k] *De vitijs corporis dicit, he meaneth it of the vitious affections of the body*. [l] *By concupiſcence is it that this our body of death is ſo called*. So *Oecumenius* ſaith, that the Apoſtle deſireth to be deliuered *from* [m] *the concupiſcences which are in the bodie, and which are death vnto vs, and do cauſe a ſpirituall death*. [n] *It is a bodie of death*, ſaith *Origen*, *wherein ſinne dwelleth which is the cauſe of death*. *Ambroſe* ſaith, that the Apoſtle calleth his body *a body of death*, [o] *becauſe we all are borne vnder ſinne, and our very beginning is in treſpaſſe*, acknowledging as touching the corruption of ſin, that what it was in the beginning, the ſame in part it continueth ſtill. *Epiphanius*, or rather *Methodius* ſaith, that the Apoſtle heere meaneth [p] *ſinne dwelling by concupiſcence in the body, from the bad imaginations & thoughts wherof he wiſhed to bee delivered, accounting the ſame death and deſtruction it ſelfe*. *Bernard* ſaith, that it was [q] *the law of ſinne, euen concupiſcence ſtanding as a wall betwixt God and him*, that made him crie out, *Who ſhall deliuer me from the body of this death?* In concupiſcence then ſtandeth *this body of death*; and becauſe by *this body of death* it is that the Apoſtle calleth himſelfe *miſerable*, it is *concupiſcence* that

[e] *Aug. contr. Iulian. lib. 6. cap. 7. Nonne concedis hominem miſerum quicunque ille fuerit: adiecerſus talem clamaſſe qualitatem, velle adiecet mihi, &c. (qua voluntas bona aut non ibi ſit, aut valere nihil poſſit.)*

[f] Rom. 6. 6.

[g] Col. 2. 11.

[h] *Aug. de perfect. iuſtit. Rat. 17. De corpore mortis huius non omnis liberatur qui finit hanc vitam.*

[i] *De nat. & grat. cap. 55. De corpore mors corporis ſeparat, ſed contracta ex illo vitia cohærent, quibus iuſta pœna debetur.*

[k] *Ibid.*

[l] *De Temp. ſer. 45. Per concupiſcentiam dictum eſt hoc noſtrum mortis corpus.*

[m] *Oecumen. in Ro. cap. 7. Ex corporalibus actionibus ſpiritualem mortem inducentibus: à concupiſcentijs quæ in corpore ſunt, quæque mors nobis ſunt:*

[n] *Orig. ibid. Corpus mortis appellatur in quo habitat peccatum quod mortis eſt cauſa.*

[o] *Ambroſe apud Aug. cont. Iulian. li. 2. Omnes homines ſub peccato naſcimur, quorum ipſe artus in vitio eſt, &c. Ideo Pauli caro corpus mortis erat, &c.*

[p] *Method. apud Epiphan. her. 64. Non corpus hoc mortem ſed peccatum inhabitans per concupiſcentiam in corpore dicit, &c.*

[q] *Bernard. in Cant. ſerm. 50. Ipſa eſt carnis concupiſcentia, &c. Hoc ſanè vno interiecto pariete non longè peregrinabatur à Domino. Vnde & optabat, clamans, Quis me liberabit, &c.*

maketh

maketh him *miſerable*, which therfore *S. Auſtin* calleth [r] *miſeram legem, the miſerable law of ſin*, not as being it ſelfe capable of miſery, but *per metonymiam*, becauſe it maketh vs miſerable, or becauſe we are miſerable by it. Thus therfore the Apoſtle acknowledgeth himſelfe *miſerable* in himſelfe, not as holding himſelfe to be in diſgrace with God, but as finding in himſelfe that for which he deſerueth ſo to be, & ſhould be, but that God in Chriſt is merciſull vnto him, not to impute the ſame. And what is it but a miſery, to haue as it were a filthy carion tied faſt to him, ſtill breathing out noyſome ſtinke? to be continually troubled with an importunat enemy, giuing him no reſt, and wearying his ſoul from day to day? nay, to cary about with him [s] *euen an army of diuers and ſundry luſts*, drawing one this way, and another that way, fighting againſt him on the right hand, and on the left, bereauing him of his ioy, whileſt in moſt earneſt meditations they carry him away whether he will or not from that wherin his delightis. If outward croſſes do make a man miſerable, much more this inward diſtraction & affliction, which galleth the ſtrings of the hart & vexeth the very ſpirit and ſoule, more then the bitterneſſe of death it ſelfe. If *M. Biſhop* knew this affliction, hee would think there were cauſe enough therein to make him crie out, *Miſerable man that I am, &c.* But his benummed heart feeleth it not, and thereore he ſpeaketh of theſe matters but as a Philoſopher in the ſchooles, without any conſcience or ſenſe of that hee ſaith, and to a formall argument, as he calleth it, giueth theſe miſ-ſhapen and deformed anſwers.

r *Auguſt. de Temp. ſer. 43.*

s *Idem. cont. Julian. Pelag. lib. 2. Exercitum quedã variarum cupiditatum intra ſemetipſum debellabat.*

5. W. BISHOP.

*Now to the ſecond.* Infants baptized, die the bodily death before they come to the yeeres of diſcretion: but there is not in them any other cauſe of death, beſides Originall ſinne, for they haue no actuall ſinne, and death is the wages of ſinne, *as the Apoſtle ſaith*, death entred into the world by ſinne. Rom. 5. & Rom. 5.

Anſ. *The cauſe of the death of ſuch Innocents, is either the diſtemperature of their bodies, or externall violence: and God who freely beſtowed their liues vpon them, may whē it pleaſeth him as freely take their liues from them, eſpecially when he meanes to recompence them with the happie exchange of life euerlaſting. True it is, that if our firſt parents had not ſinned, no man ſhould haue died, but haue beene both long preſerued in Paradiſe, by the fruit of the wood of life, and finally tranſlated with-*

*on: death into the Kingdome of heauen: and therfore is it ſayd moſt truly of* S. Paul, Death entred into the world by ſinne. *But the other place,* The wages of ſinne is death, *is fouly abuſed for the Apoſtle there by death vnderſtandeth eternall damnation, as appeareth by the oppoſition of it to life euerlaſting: and by ſinne there meaneth not Originall, but actuall ſinne, ſuch as the Romans commiteed in their infidelity, the wages whereof, if they had not repented them, had bene hell fire: now to infer that Innocents are puniſhed with corporall death for Originall ſin remaining in them, becauſe that eternall death is the due hire of actuall ſinne, is either to ſhew great want of iudgement, or elſe very ſtrangely to peruert the words of holy Scripture. Let this alſo not be forgotten, that he himſelfe acknowledged in our Conſent: that the puniſhment of Originall ſinne was taken away in Baptiſme from the regenerate: how then doth he here ſay, that he doth die the death for it?*

Rom. 5. Rom 6.

## R. Abbot.

The example of infants dying after Baptiſme before they come to yeares of diſcretion, is rightly alledged to proue that ſinne remaineth after Baptiſme, becauſe where there is no ſin there can be no death. To this *M. Biſhop* ſendeth vs a moſt pitiful and miſerable anſwer, that the cauſe of the death of infants is not ſin, but *either the diſtemperature of their bodies or externall violence.* Thus hee would maintaine a priuiledge to infants againſt the words of *S. Iohn*, [a] *If we ſay we haue no ſinne, we deceiue our ſelues*; that they may ſay, *we ſay we haue no ſinne, and we doe not therein deceiue our ſelues:* and though we die, yet it is not by reaſon of ſin that we die, but either by the diſtemperature of our bodies, or externall violence. But if *M. Perkins* had ſayd as he might haue ſayd, Infants after Baptiſme are ſubiect to diſtemperature of body, and externall violence, and death following, all which are the proper effects of ſinne; therefore they are not without ſinne, in what a wofull caſe had *M. Biſhop* bene, and how had he bene put to his ſhifts to deuiſe an anſwer? Surely S. *Auſtin* ſaith, that [b] *we ſuffer not any thing in this life, but by reaſon of that death which we deſerued by the firſt ſinne.* And ſo ſaith *Origen* verie rightly, that [c] *death and all other frailtie in the fleſh was brought vpon vs by the condition or ſtate of ſin.* Therfore diſtemperature, & weakneſſe, and ſickenes, and ſuffering of externall violence, are no leſſe arguments of ſinne then death it ſelfe, and how then doth hee make theſe

a 1. Ioh. 1. 8.

b *Auguſt. in Pſ. 37. Non aliquid patimur in iſta vita niſi ex illa morte quã meruimus primo peccato*

c *Origen. in Leuit hom. 2. Nobis hominibus ſal mors vel reliqua omnis fragilitas in carne ex peccati conditione ſuperducta eſt.*

theſe the cauſes of death without ſinne, when they are no otherwiſe the cauſes of death but by reaſon of ſinne? But hee addeth further, that *God who freely beſtowed their liues on them, may when it pleaſeth him as freely take their liues from them.* But yet if there be no ſin, and if it be as the Trent Councell ſaith, that *there is nothing in them that God hateth, nothing that hindreth them from entring into heauen,* why then doth God without cauſe take away their life, and not rather without death receiue them vnto himſelfe? why doth he not immediatly [d] *cloth them vpon that mortality may bee ſwallowed vp of life?* This is a myſtery to *M. Biſhop*, & he cannot tel what to ſay thereof But the dying of baptized infants, ſheweth that there is ſtill in the *a corruption of fleſh and bloud,* by which the ſentence of the Apoſtle taketh hold of them, [e] *fleſh and bloud cannot inherit the kingdome of God, neither ſhall corruption inherite incorruption.* The cauſe of their death is the putting off of this corruptiõ, the diſſolution & full mortification of the body of ſin, that this ſlough being caſt off, and mortalitie changed into immortality, & corruption into incorruption, they may be fit for the inheritance of the kingdome of God. Thus *Epiphanius* bringeth in *Methodius* diſputing againſt *Proclus* the Origeniſt, that [f] *God as the true Phyſition hath appointed death for a medicinable purgation for the vtter rooting out and putting away of ſinne, that we may be made faultleſſe and innocent;* and that *as a goodly golden image ſightly and ſeemely in all parts, if it be broken and defaced by any meanes, muſt be new caſt and framed againe for the taking away of the blemiſhes and diſgraces of it, euen ſo man, the image of God, being maimed and diſgraced by ſinne, for the putting away of thoſe diſgraces, and the repairing of his ruines and decayes, muſt by death be diſſolued vnto the earth, thence to be raiſed vp again perfect and without default.* Now if *M. Biſhop* will not learne it of vs, yet let him learne it of theſe ancient Fathers, that ſin is the cauſe of death, euen in them to whom notwithſtanding it is forgiuen & pardoned for Chriſts ſake. But he goeth further, *True it is that if our firſt parents had not ſinned, no man ſhould haue died, but both haue bene long preſerued in Paradiſe by the fruit of the wood of life: and finally tranſlated without death into the kingdome of heauen.* But ſince they haue ſinned, what? Marry it *is moſt truely ſaid by S. Paul, Death entred into the world by ſinne.* Well then, if it entred by ſin into the world, doth it continue in the world by any other thing then by which it firſt entred? Nay, as it

d 2. Cor. 5. 4.

e 1. Cor. 15. 50.

f Epiphan. her. 64. ex Methodio. *In anxilatu medicamenti modum ab auxiliatore noſtro & verè medico Deo ad eradicationem peccati ac delectionem aſſumpta eſt mors &c. Inſtar medicamentarie purgationis mortem Deus benè inuenit quo ſic omnino inculpabiles & innoxij inueniamur &c. videtur vel ſi quis ſummus opifex ſtatuam pulchram ex auro aut alia materia à ſe conſtructam rurſus conflet mutilatam reparet & conſpicatus à peſſimo quodam homine, &c.*

entred by ſinne, ſo ſinne is the onely cauſe of the continuing of it, and without ſinne there is no death: in the failing of the cauſe muſt needs be a ſurceaſing of the effect. Now to ſhew that death is the proper effect of ſin, *M. Perkins* alledgeth the words of the Apoſtle, *The wages of ſinne is death.* But *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that this place is foully abuſed by him. And why ſo? Forſooth the Apoſtle here *by death meaneth eternall damnation.* And what then? Doth he therfore not meane bodily death alſo? Surely the Apoſtle alludeth to that that God ſaid to our Father *Adam* in the beginning: [g] *In the day that thou ſhalt eate of that forbidden tree, thou ſhalt die the death,* thereby threatning vnto him both the firſt and ſecond death. And in that meaning hath the Apoſtle ſpoken of death in the chapter going before, that *by ſinne came death, &c.* Therefore *M. Biſhops* great maiſter *Thomas Aquinas* telleth him, that when the Apoſtle immediately before ſaith, *the end of thoſe things is death,* he meneth by death [h] *both temporall and eternall death.* An other exception is, that *ſinne* is here taken onely for *Actuall ſinne*; which is a fiction meerly abſurd and vaine. For it is a propoſition vniuerſall concerning all ſinne, and ſo vſed vniuerſally by al writers: and if it be true of Actuall ſinne, that the wages of ſinne is death, much more is it true of Originall ſinne, which is the filthy and corrupt fountaine whence all actuall ſins do ſpring. And that we may know that *M. Biſhop* himſelfe is of no other mind, he himſelfe hath vſed it in the ſection next ſaue one before this, concerning *Originall ſinne*, arguing that if Originall ſinne were properly ſinne in the regenerate, then it ſhould cauſe death vnto them, becauſe *the wages of ſinne is death.* Whereby it appeareth, that he ſpeaketh but at all aduenture, and to ſerue the preſent turn, without any conſcience or regard of that he ſpeaketh, whether it be true or falſe. He hath bene brought vp in *Bellarmines* ſchoole, and of him hath learned to care no further, but onely to ſay ſomewhat, though it be ſtarke naught. Now for concluſion of this point he ſaith, *Let not this be forgotten, that hee himſelfe acknowledged in our Conſent, that the puniſhment of Original ſinne is taken away in Baptiſme from the regenerate.* True, & what then? *How then,* ſaith he, *doth he ſay here, that he doth die the death for it?* But he ſaith not ſo, neither is it ſo: for if hee ſhould die the death for Originall ſinne, hee ſhould die alſo the eternall death, which notwithſtanding by Chriſt is taken away. This death

g Gen 2.17.

h *Tho. Aquin. in Rom. cap. 6. Peccata de ſe nata ſint inducere mortem temporalem & æternam. Et in marg. finis peccatorum tam temporalis quàm æterna.*

death therefore to the regenerate is not in the nature of a puniſhment, but rather of a medicine, as hath beene already ſaid, for the vtter diſſoluing, and mortifying, and deſtroying of the bodie of ſinne, that onely righteouſneſſe may liue in them. It followeth as a wages of ſinne according to the words of the Apoſtle in it owne nature due vnto it, though now payed for other end then it was before.

## 6. W. Bishop.

M. Perkins *third reaſon:* That which luſteth againſt the ſpirit, & by luſting tempteth, and in tempting inticeth and draweth the hart to ſinne, is for nature ſinne it ſelfe: but concupiſcence in the regenerate is ſuch: *Ergo.*

Anſw. *The firſt propoſition is not true: for not euery thing that intiſeth vs to ſinne, is ſinne: or elſe the Apple that allured* Eue *to ſinne, had bene by nature ſinne: and euery thing in this world one way or another tempteth vs to ſinne: according vnto that of* S. Iohn: All that is in the world, is the Concupiſcence of the fleſh, and the Concupiſcence of the eyes, and Pride of life: *So that it is very groſſe to ſay that euery thing which allureth to ſinne, is ſinne it ſelfe, and as wide is it from all morall wiſedome to affirme, that the firſt motions of our paſſions bee ſins. For euen the very heathen Philoſophers could diſtinguiſh betweene ſudden paſſions of the mind and vices: teaching that paſſions may be bridled by the vnderſtanding, and brought by due ordering of them into the ring of reaſon, and ſo made vertues rather then vices. And that ſame text which* M. Perkins *bringeth to perſwade theſe temptations to bee ſinnes, proues the quite contrary.* God tempteth no man; but euery man is tempted when he is drawne away by his owne concupiſcence, and is allured: after when concupiſcence hath conceiued, it bringeth forth ſinne: *Marke the words well. Firſt, Concupiſcence tempteth, and allureth by ſome euill motion, but that is no ſinne, vntill afterward it do conceiue, that is, obtaine ſome liking of our will, in giuing eare to it, and not expelling it ſo ſpeedily as we ought to do the ſuggeſtion of ſuch an enemie: the which that moſt deepe Doctor* S. Auguſtine *ſifteth out very profoundly in theſe words:* When the Apoſtle S. *Iames* ſaith, euery man is tempted, being drawne away and allured by his Concupiſcence, and afterward Concupiſcence when it hath conceiued, bringeth forth ſin: Truly in theſe words, the thing brought forth is

1. Epi. 2.

Iacob. 1.

*Lib. 6. in. Iul. cap. 5.*

diſtinguiſhed, from that which bringeth it forth. The dam is concupiſcence, the ſole is ſinne. But concupiſcence doth not bring ſin forth, vnleſſe it conceiue, (*ſo then it is not ſinne of it ſelfe*) and it conceiueth not, vnleſſe it draw vs, that is, vnleſſe it obtaine the conſent of our will, to commit euill. *The like expoſition of the ſame place, and the difference betweene the pleaſure tempting, that runneth before, and the ſin which followeth after*, vnleſſe we reſiſt manfully, *may be ſeene in* S. Cyril, *ſo that by the iudgement of the moſt learned ancient fathers, that text of* S. Iames *cited by* M. Perkins, *to proue concupiſcence to be ſin, diſproueth it very ſoundly: to that reaſon of his*, Such as the Fruit is ſuch is the Tree: *I anſwere, that not concupiſcence, but the will of man is the Tree: which bringeth forth, either good or bad fruit, according vnto the diſpoſition of it: concupiſcence is onely an intiſer vnto bad.*

*Lib. 4. in Iohan. cap. 15.*

R. Abbot.

Againſt *M. Perkins* firſt propoſition, *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *not euery thing that enticeth vs to ſinne is ſinne*. But therein he ſaith vntruely, if he meane as he ſhould do, of that that is in man himſelfe. It is generally true that there is nothing that tempteth or enticeth to ſinne, which hath not it ſelfe the nature of ſinne, either as the ſubiect or as the thing it ſelfe, ſo that concupiſcence becauſe it cannot be ſaid to be the ſubiect, muſt neceſſarily be holden to be ſin it ſelfe. His exceptions to the contrary are very ſond. Firſt, that then *the apple that allured Eue to ſinne had bene by nature ſinne*: and ſecondly, that *euery thing in the world one way or another tempteth vs to ſinne*. But where hath he euer read, that *the apple*, if it were an apple, *tempted or inticed Eue?* Did the apple any thing more then it did before, or was it any other then it was before? Surely there was no change in the apple, but the change was in her ſelfe, and therefore as it did not tempt her before, ſo neither could it bee ſaid to tempt her in that temptation. And what is this, but to make God the tempter, who was the maker of the apple, contrary to the words of S. *Iames*, that [a] *God tempteth no man to euill?* Which wee muſt likewiſe ſay of all other things in the world, if it be true that *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *they tempt vs to ſinne*. For though God himſelfe immediately do not tempt vs, yet if the creatures of the world do tempt vs, the accuſation redoundeth to him, becauſe in the creatures there is nothing but his worke. They are fair and beautiful, they are pleaſant to ſight and

[a] Iam. 1. 13.

and vse, but do they therefore tempt to sin? Did the Sun tempt the heathen idolaters to worship it? Did [b] *Thamar* tempt *Amnon* to filthines, or [c] *Susanna* the wicked elders? Nay, as *S. Iames* telleth vs, it is our own sinfull *lust* that *tempteth* vs to abuse the good creatures of God, which thēselues tēpt vs not, but rather as *S. Paul* teacheth vs, [d] *they grone and trauaile in pain, because* [e] *they are subiect to our vanity*, and therfore [f] *wait when the sons of God shalbe reuealed, that they may be deliuered from the bondage of our corruption, into the glorious liberty of the sonnes of God.* But he alledgeth to his purpose the words of S. *Iohn*: *All that is in the world is the concupiscence of the flesh, and the concupiscence of the eies and pride of life.* Where if we consider the Apostles words as they lie, we shall see how iustly it may be returned to himselfe, which a little before he said of *M. Perkins*, that *either he sheweth great want of iudgement, or else verie strangelie peruerteth the words of holy Scripture.* The thing that he hath to prooue, is that *euerie thing in this world tempteth vs to sin.* The words of *S. Iohn* are, [g] *All that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eies, the pride of life, is not of the Father, but of the world.* He speaketh of *the things of the world, which are of the Father*, because they are his creatures: *S. Iohn* speaketh of *the things of the world, which are not of the Father.* He speaketh of *the world*, which is the creature and frame of heauen and earth, & all things therein: *S. Iohn* speaketh [h] not of the *world* in that meaning, but of the *world* of mākind corrupted & defiled with sinne, according to which the vnregenerate are called [i] *the children of this world*, and as our Sauiour Christ saith, that [k] *the world hated him because he testified of it, that the workes therof are euill.* And doth he not then, thinke you, bring vs a good proofe, th at *euery thing in the world tempteth vs to sinne?* The meaning of *S. Iohn* is plaine, that *in the world*, that is to say, in the men of this world, there is nothing but corruption, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eies, the pride of life, and the following of all these, all which are not of the Father, nor haue accord with him, but are of men themselues, & perish together with themselues. What is this then but profanely and lewdly to abuse the word of God, thus to cite it to prooue a falshood, when it hath not so much as any shew of that for which it is cited? If it be grosse to say, that whatsoeuer allureth to sinne is sinne, I am sure it is much more grosse, that he hath said for the disprooving of it. He addeth further, that it is *as wide from all moral wisedome to affirme*

[b] 2. Sam. 13. 2.
[c] Dan. 13. 8.
[d] Rom. 8. 22.
[e] Ver. 20.
[f] Ver. 19. 21.
[g] Ioh. 2. 16.
[h] *Aug. cont. Iulian. lib. 4. cap. 13. Notissimus Ioannē non mundum istum id est, cœlum & terram & omnia quæ in eo substantialiter sunt, reprehendisse cum diceret, Omnia quæ in mundo sunt, &c.*
[i] Luk. 16. 8.
[k] Joh. 7. 7.

*that the firſt motions of our paſſions be ſins.* But wee iudge not of theſe things by *morall wiſedome*, which is *the wiſedome of this world*, becauſe [l] *the world by it owne wiſdome knoweth not God in the wiſdome of God*; wee eſteeme heereof, as God by the *fooliſhneſſe* of the Apoſtles *preaching* hath taught vs to beleeue. And out of their preaching we haue learned to ſay as *S. Auſtine* did, that [m] *luſt it ſelfe by it ſelfe is very iuſtly accuſed or blamed in the very motions of it, wherein it is reſiſted that it exceede not*, and that [n] *howſoeuer in this conflict of the ſpirite againſt the fleſh we get the better, yet if in the verie motions & affections of our thought, we ſay that we haue no ſinne, we deceiue our ſelues, and there is no truth in vs.* But ſaith he, *heathen Philoſophers could diſtinguiſh betweene ſudden paſſions of the mind and vices.* But what is it to vs what heathen Philoſophers haue diſtinguiſhed, ſeeing Chriſtian Philoſophers haue taught vs to call theſe paſſions, [o] *vices, inward vices, vitiouſneſſe, vitious affections, vitious concupiſcences*, or *luſts*? Let *M. Biſhop* follow Philoſophers if he pleaſe; as for vs we ſay in theſe queſtions of Diuinity, as *Tertullian* ſaid, that [p] *Philoſophie is but a ſawcie interpreter of Gods nature and diſpoſition*, & that Philoſophers are [q] *the Patriarches of heretikes.* Wee take our inſtructions out of *Solomons* porch, not out of the porch of *Zeno*; from Hieruſalem, not from Athens; and there we haue learned to call it *ſinne* whatſoeuer ſwarueth from the law of God, as before hath beene declared. Yea but *M. Biſhop* will proue out of that verie text which *M. Perkins* alleageth, that *concupiſcence* is not *ſinne*. [r] *Euery man*, ſaith *S. Iames*, *is tempted when hee is drawne away by his owne concupiſcence, and is allured: afterward concupiſcence when it hath conceiued, bringeth foorth ſinne. Marke well the words*, ſaith hee. *Firſt concupiſcence tempteth and allureth by ſome euill motion, but that is no ſinne, vntill afterward it do conceiue.* But how doth hee proue that by any argument out of *S. Iames* his words? What, is it not ſin becauſe *S. Iames* doth not expreſly call it ſin? VVhy then neither ſhall the conſent be ſin, becauſe *S. Iames* expreſſeth the conſent firſt, and afterwards interreth the *bringing forth of ſinne.* But though *S. Iames* doe not call it expreſly *ſinne*, yet *S. Paul* doth. For what *S. Iames* ſpeaketh of *concupiſcence*, ſtirring vppe euill motions, and thereby tempting and entiſing, the verie ſame *S. Paul* expreſſeth in theſe words, [s] *Sinne wrought in mee all manner of concupiſcence.* Which is the ſame as if hee ſhould haue ſaid, that concupiſcence which is the habite of ſin, did ſtir vp in him all

[l] 1. Cor. 1. 21.

[m] *Aug. cont. Iulian. lib. 4. cap. 3. Ipſa per ſe iſt ſam libido rectiſſimè omnino ſuis ipſis motibus accuſatur quibus ne excedat obſiſtitur.*

[n] *Ibid. li. 5. cap. 5. Quantumlibet in iſto conflictu ſuperiores ſimus, &c. tamè ipſis certè noſtræ cogitationis motibus & affectibus ſi dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, &c.*

[o] See after Sect. 9.

[p] *Tertul. de præſcript. aduhæret. philoſophia temeraria interpres diuinæ naturæ & diſpoſitionis.*

[q] *Idem. cont. Hermogen. Hæreticorum patriarche philoſophi.*

[r] Iam. 1. 14.

[s] Rom. 7. 8.

all maner of euill motions and affections to tempt him thereby. The ſame Apoſtle ſaith, [t] *Let not ſinne raigne in your mortall bodies, that yee ſhould obey it in the luſts thereof*, calling it by the name of ſin, where it raigneth not, nor is obeied in *the luſts of it*. Hee diſtinctly noteth *ſinne*, and the *luſts* of it, and the *obeying*, that is, conſenting to thoſe luſts, and ſo plainly ſheweth, that in the roote, and from the beginning it is ſinne. Thus the faithfull elſewhere are warned to take heede not to be hardened [u] *by the ſeducing (or deceitfulneſſe) of ſinne*, where it is alſo plaine, that it is *ſinne* which ſeduceth and enticeth, euen as the Apoſtle ſaith, [x] *Sinne ſeduced mee (or deceiued mee) and thereby ſlue mee*, giuing to vnderſtand, that theſe *ſeducings* and *enticings*, that is, the firſt motions of concupiſcence, are ſo farre *ſin*, as that thereby hee felt himſelfe in himſelfe to bee but a dead man. Thus the Apoſtle S. *Paul* thwarteth all that *M. Biſhop* gathereth out of S. *Iames* his words: but yet *the moſt deepe Doctor S. Auſtine fifteth out the matter very profoundly* for him. And indeede he ſifteth well, but leaueth to *M. Biſhop* nothing but the very branne. [y] *In theſe words* (ſaith hee) *the birth is diſtinguiſhed from that that bringeth foorth. That that bringeth foorth is concupiſcene, the birth is ſinne. But concupiſcence bringeth not foorth except it conceiue. So then*, (ſaith *M. Biſhop*) *it is not ſinne of it ſelfe*. But we deny his argument: for a mother bringeth foorth a woman, and yet ſhee her ſelfe is a woman alſo. A woman bringeth not foorth a woman, except ſhe firſt conceiue, and yet ſhee is a woman before ſhee doe conceiue, and ſinne bringeth not foorth ſinne, except by conſent it firſt conceiue, and yet it is ſinne before conception. There is nothing in Saint *Auſtins* words, but ſtandeth well with that that before hath beene ſaid, that *concupiſcence* beeing the habite of *ſinne*, doth by gaining the conſent of the will, bring foorth actuall and outward ſinnes, which is the true meaning of that place of *Iames*. And that he did not otherwiſe conceiue, but that *concupiſcence* is *ſinne*, *M. Biſhop* might very well haue ſeene, if he had but read the words a few lines before the place which he citeth, where ſpeaking of the ſame beeing in vs, hee ſaith, [z] *It ſhould not onely be in vs, but alſo greatly hurt vs, but that the guilt thereof is acquitted by the forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes*. Wee would haue *M. Biſhop* tell vs, how it ſhould hurt vs if it bee not ſinne: for wee ſuppoſe that there is nothing in man that can hurt him, but onely ſinne, eſpecially the hurt beeing ſuch, as *S. Auſtine* anon after ſpeaketh.

[t] Cap. 6. 12.

[u] Heb. 3. 13.

[x] Rom. 7. 11.

[y] *Aug. contra Iulian. lib. 6. ca. 5. Profectò in hu verbis partus à pariente diſtinguitur. Partus eſt concupiſcentia, partus peccatum. Sed concupiſcentia non parit niſi in conceperit: Nec concipit niſi illexerit, hoc eſt, ad malum perpetrãdum obtinuerit voluntis aſſenſus.*

[z] *Ibid. Non tantùm ineſſet, verùm & grauiter obeſſet, niſi reatus quamuis obſtrinxerat per remiſſionẽ peccatorũ ſolutus eſſet.*

keth of, [a] *to draw vs, onelie by beeing in vs, to euerlaſting death.* The place of *Cyril* affirmeth the being of luſt [b] *ante peccandi actum, before the actuall ſinne,* but hath nothing for *M. Biſhops* turne to prooue, that *luſt* alſo is not *ſinne,* nay in the words immediatly following, he proueth that it is ſinne, affirming, that [c] *by circumciſion wee ſhould learne, that we ſhall not be cleane, vnleſſe we caſt out of our mind all filthy luſt.* For if luſt it ſelfe do makevs vncleane, it muſt needes be ſinne, becauſe nothing can make a man vncleane but onelie *ſinne.* That which *M. Perkins* addeth to illuſtrate this point, *Such as the fruit is, ſuch is the tree,* was verie fitly ſpoken to the matter in hand. For the fruite hath it whole nature and qualitie from the tree, neither is it any thing, but what it is by that that it receiueth from thence. If therefore the actions of *concupiſcence* be ſinne, *concupiſcence* which is the tree, muſt needes haue the nature and condition of ſinne. But *M. Biſhop* anſwereth, that *not concupiſcence, but the will of man is the tree.* Which is all one as if hee ſhould haue ſaid, that *not the will of man, but the will of man is the tree.* For it hath beene before ſhewed, that *concupiſcence* is nothing elſe, but *the corrupted will of man,* which doth not bring foorth *either euill or good* indifferentlie, but is of it ſelfe *an enticer only vnto bad,* vntill God do create it anew, and by his owne hand doe worke in it to will that that is good. In a word, the holy Scripture as on the one ſide it calleth the motions of *concupiſcence,* [d] *the luſts of the fleſh,* ſo it calleth alſo the effects and deeds of thoſe luſts, *the works of the fleſh*; thereby ſhewing, that *concupiſcence* ſignified by the name of [e] *fleſh,* and importing the corruption of the whole mind and will of man, is rightlie ſaid to be the *tree* or *euill roote* whence all euill workes, & all wickednes doſpring.

[a] *Tantum quia trahit, vt ſi pertraheret ad vltimam mortem.*

[b] *Cyril. in Joan. lib. 4. cap. 51. Feruens cupiditas ante peccandi actum inſidet.*

[c] *Vt hoc enigmate perdiſcamus nullo nos pacto mundos vnquam futuros niſi omnē turpem ex animo cupiditatem ejiciamus.*

d 1. Pet. 2. 11.

e Gal. 5. 9.

## 7. W. Bishop.

Lib. 5. contr. Iulian. cap. 3.

*But* S. Auguſtine *ſaith,* that concupiſcence is ſinne, becauſe in it there is diſobedience againſt the rule of the mind, &c. *I anſwer, that* S. Auguſtine *in more then twenty places of his workes teacheth expreſly, that concupiſcence is no ſinne, if ſin be taken properly: wherefore when hee once calleth it ſinne, he taketh ſinne largely as it comprehendeth, not onely all ſinne, but alſo all motions and enticements to ſinne: in which ſence concupiſcence may hee termed ſinne: but it is ſo called very ſeldome of* S. Auguſtine, *but more commonly an euill, as in the ſame worke is to be ſeene euidently, where he ſaith:* That grace in Baptiſme

Lib. 6. cap. 5.

doth

doth renew a man perfectly, ſo farreforth as it appertaineth to the deliuerance of him from all manner of ſinne; but not ſo, as it freeth him from all euill: *ſo that concupiſcence remaining after baptiſme, is no manner of ſinne, in* S. Auguſtines *iudgment: but may be called euill, becauſe it prouoketh vs to euill. To this place of* A. Auguſtine, *I will ioyne that other like, which* M. Perkins *quoteth in his fourth reaſon: where he ſaith,* that ſinne dwelleth alwaies in our members. *The ſame anſwer ſerueth, that ſin there is taken improperly: as appeareth by that he ſeates it in our members: for according vnto* S. Auguſtine *and all the learned, the ſubiect of ſin being properly taken is not in any part of the body, but in the will and ſoule, and in the ſame paſſage he ſignifieth plainely, that in baptiſme all ſinnes and iniquitie is taken awaie, and that there is left in the regenerate, onely an infirmity or weakneſſe.*

Tract. 41. in Ioan.

R. Abbot.

That place of *Auſtin* doth very pregnantly ſhew, that *concupiſcence* is truely and properly called *ſinne*, and giueth a reaſon therof out of the true nature of *ſinne*, which before hath bin declared.[a] *As blindneſſe of heart* (ſaith he) *is both a ſinne whereby man beleeueth not, and the puniſhment of ſinne, wherewith the pride of the heart is iuſtly reuenged; and the cauſe of ſinne whileſt any euill is committed by the error of the hart ſo blinded: ſo the concupiſcence of the fleſh, againſt which the good ſpirit deſireth, is both ſinne, becauſe there is in it a diſobedience againſt the rule of the mind, and the puniſhment of ſinne, becauſe it was rendred to the deſert of him that obeyed not, and the cauſe of ſinne either by the default of him that conſenteth vnto it, or by infecting of him that is borne of it.* Concupiſcence then is *ſinne, as blindneſſe of heart is ſinne.* But *blindnes of heart* is properly *ſinne, therfore concupiſcence* is ſo alſo. *Rebellion againſt the law of the mind,* whereby is meant *the law of God,* is properly ſinne, as before is ſhewed. But *concupiſcence* is a habit of *Rebellion againſt the law of God: it* is therefore properly to be accounted *ſinne.* And whereas *Auſtin* when hee denieth *concupiſcence* to bee *ſinne,* ſaith it is therefore called *ſinne,* becauſe it is *the puniſhment of ſinne, and the cauſe of ſinne,* heere he affirmeth that it is not only *the puniſhment of ſinne, and the cauſe of ſinne,* but otherwiſe alſo *ſinne,* and therefore properly and truely *ſinne.* But *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that *Auſtin in more then twentie places of his workes teacheth expreſly, that concupiſcence is no ſinne, if ſinne be taken properly.*

[a] *Auguſt. contr. Iulian. lib. 5. ca. 3. Sicut cecitas cordis & peccatum eſt quo in Deum vnus creditur, & pœna peccati qua cor ſuperbum digna animaduerſione punitur, & cauſa peccati, cum mala aliquid caeci cordis errore committitur: ita concupiſcentia carnis aduerſus quam bonus concupiſcit ſpiritus, & peccatum eſt quia ineſt illi inobedientia contra dominationem, & pœna peccati eſt, quia reddita eſt meritis inobedientiæ: & cauſa peccati eſt defectione conſentientis vel contagione naſcentis.*

perly. Yet *S. Auſtine* in thoſe twentie places ſaith nothing of ſinne *properly or vnproperly* taken, and indeede taketh ſinne vnproperly, when he denieth concupiſcence to bee *ſinne*, as anon ſhall appeare. He ſaith further, that *when Auſtine calleth concupiſcence ſinne, hee taketh ſinne largely, as it comprehendeth not onely all ſinne, but alſo all motions and enticements to ſinne, and ſo it may be tearmed ſinne.* And this large taking of ſinne, we ſay is the proper taking of it, and thereby concupiſcence is properly called *ſinne*. But *the motions and enticements to ſinne*, being the ſame with *concupiſcence*, we ſee what a proper ſecret he hath heere deliuered, that *concupiſcence* may bee tearmed *ſinne*, as *ſinne* is taken largely, ſo as to comprehend concupiſcence. A learned note. But becauſe the reaſon that he hath before deliuered is ſtarke naught, hee ſhould haue giuen vs heere a better reaſon, why the name of ſinne is not properly to bee vnderſtood, when *concupiſcence is called ſinne.* He telleth vs, that *with Auſtin it is more commonly called an euill*, and indeede it is true, that verie often hee ſo calleth it, but yet ſuch an *euill*, as maketh a man *euill*, ſo that by reaſon thereof, [a] *though a man be a Prophet, a Patriarch, an Apoſtle, yet* (ſaith *Hierome*) *it is ſaid vnto them by our Sauiour, If yee being euill do know to giue good gifts to your children, &c.* Now there is nothing that maketh a man euill, but that which is properlie ſinne. Concupiſcence therefore is properlie a ſin. But of this ſhall be ſpoken more at large anon. Onely heere it is to bee obſerued, how *M. Biſhop* vnderſtandeth it to bee *an euill, becauſe it prouoketh vs to euill.* So hee will haue it no otherwiſe called *an euill*, then it is called *ſinne*. It is *ſinne*, becauſe it prouoketh to ſinne; and ſo *euill*, becauſe it prouoketh to euill, and ſo indeede properlie ſhall be neither *ſinne* nor *euill*, whereas *S. Auſtine* acquitting it in ſome meaning from the name of *ſinne*, leaueth it ſimplie and abſolutelie in the name and nature of *euill*, as ſhall appeare. To this place hee bringeth another teſtimony of *Auſtine*, which *M. Perkins* alleageth in the fourth reaſon, and giueth to it a verie vnproper anſwer. [b] *So long as thou liueſt* (ſaith *Auſtine*) *of neceſſity ſinne muſt bee in thy members: ſinne is there alſo taken vnproperly*, ſaith *M. Biſhope*. And yet *S. Auſtine* deduceth that aſſertion from the words of *S. Iohn*: [c] *If we ſay wee haue no ſinne, we deceiue our ſelues, and the truth is not in vs*, alleaging the one, and concluding the other by occaſiõ of the words of our Sauiour Chriſt, [d] *He that committeth ſin is the ſeruant of ſinne, and the ſeruant abideth not*

[a] *Hieron. aduer. Pelag. lib. 3. Quãuis Patriarcha ſit aliquis, quamuis Propheta, quãuis Apoſtolus, dicitur ei à Domino Saluatore: Si vos cùm ſitis mali &c.*

[b] *Auguſt. in Ioan. Tract. 41. Quamdiu vitis neceſſe eſt eſſe peccatum in membris tuis.*

[c] 1. Ioh. 1. 8.

[d] Joh. 8. 34.

*not in the houſe for euer.* For hereupon he asketh the queſtion, *what hope then haue wee, who are not without ſinne?* and anſwereth at large, that ſinne, though according to the words of *S. Iohn* we cannot be without it ſo long as we liue heere, yet ſhall not hurt vs if wee do not by ſuffering it to raigne, make our ſelues ſeruants vnto it, becauſe hee onely that *committeth ſinne* by courſe and practiſe of euill conuerſation, is the *ſeruant of ſinne*, that is to ſay, of inward corruption. Now therefore if we will follow *M. Biſhops* conſtruction, wee muſt vnderſtand *S. Iohn* alſo of ſinne vnproperly taken, and affirme contrarie to the auncient receiued Maxime of Chriſtian faith, that if *ſinne* be properly taken, it may be truly ſaid of ſome men, that they are without *ſinne*, becauſe hee ſaith it is not true of *ſinne* properly taken, that ſo long as a man liueth, it muſt needes be in him, as *S. Auſtine* ſpeaketh. Now hee will proue, that *ſin* is there vnproperly taken, *becauſe S. Auſtine placeth it in the members: For according to S. Auſtine and all the learned, the ſubiect of ſinne properly taken, is not in any part of the body, but in the will and ſoule.* Where wee may iuſtly ſmile at his ridiculous and childiſh ignorance. Why, *M. Biſhop* is *concupiſcence* any otherwiſe in the members of the bodie, but onely by the ſoule? *Iulian* the Pelagian was not ſo groſſe, but that hee knew, that [a] *the fleſh is ſaid to luſt, becauſe the ſoule luſteth according to the fleſh*, which *S. Auſtine* confirmeth and ſaith, that [b] *it is the ſoule it ſelfe, which by it owne motions which it hath according to the ſpirit, is contrarie to other motions of it owne, which it hath according to the fleſh: and by it owne motions which it hath according to the fleſh, is contrarie to other motions of it owne, which it hath according to the ſpirite, and that therefore the fleſh is ſaid to luſt contrary to the ſpirite, and the Spirit contrarie to the fleſh. Who knoweth not this*, ſaith he to *Iulian, which thou like a great Doctor ſo often telleſt vs?* And what, doth not *M. Biſhop* knowe it, that will bee taken for ſo great a Doctor in the Church of Rome? Let me tell him once againe, that the *ſoule* is the proper and immediate ſubiect of *concupiſcence*, that *to luſt is an act of a nature endued with life and ſenſe*, which the body is not of it ſelfe, but onely by the *ſoule*: and therefore that that exception of his maketh nothing to the contrarie, but that *S. Auſtine* by *ſinne in the members*, doth vnderſtand that that is properlie and truly called *ſinne*, to ſay nothing of that I haue before declared, that by concupiſcence is alſo vnderſtood the will it ſelfe, thrall and ſubiect vnto *ſinne.*

[a] *Aug. contra Iulian. lib. 6. ca. 5. Quia carnaliter anima cõcupiſcit.*

[b] *Ibid. Motibus ſuis anima quos habet ſecundum ſpiritum aduerſatur alijs motibus ſuis quos habet ſecundum carnem, & rurſus motibus ſuis quos habet ſecundum carnem, aduerſatur alijs motibus ſuis quos habet ſecundum ſpiritum, & ideò dicitur caro concupiſcere aduerſus ſpiritum, &c.*

*ſin.* For concluſion of this point hee addeth, that *S. Auſtine in the ſame paſſage ſignifieth plainely, that in baptiſme all ſinne and iniquity is taken away, and that there is left in the regenerate onely an infirmitie and weakneſſe.* But it is his ſingular impudencie to alledge *S. Auſtin* ſo directly contrary to his whole drift and purpoſe in that place, which is, as before was ſaid, to ſhew, that *ſinne* is in vs whileſt wee liue, onely that it may not hurt vs we muſt haue care that wee make not our ſelues the ſeruants of it. Whereas hee ſaith, that *iniquitie is taken away*, hee meaneth it of the guilt thereof, which ceaſſeth in the regenerate by the forgiueneſſe of their ſinnes, but otherewiſe hee himſelfe affirmeth and approueth *Ambroſe* affirming the ſame, that [g] *it is an iniquity in vs, that the fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit, albeit it be not ſuffered to ouercome.* He ſaith, that the *iniquitie beeing taken away, there remaineth an infirmitie*, but not taking *infirmitie* in that ſenſe as *M. Biſhop* doth, for a meere *weakneſſe*: but for that that hee himſelfe elſewhere expoundeth it, when hee ſaith, that [h] *ignorance and infirmitie are the vices which do hinder the will, that it moueth not to doe good, or to abſtaine from euill*; which hee calleth elſewhere [i] *the penalties of euerie ſoule of man.* Whereby it appeareth, that by *infirmitie* hee meaneth that vitiouſneſſe and corruption of mans nature, which enſued of the firſt ſinne, whereby it is diſabled to the doing of good and forbearing of euill, which in part is cured in regeneration, but yet in part hee ſaith is remaining ſtill. Thus *M. Biſhop* wee ſee, maketh the beſt ſhift hee can with words, becauſe in matter hee can light vpon nothing to ſerue his turne.

[g] *Contra Iulian. lib. 2. & lib. 9. cap. 8. Neque enim nulla eſt iniquitas cùm in vno homine vel ſuperiora inferioribus turpiter ſeruiunt, vel inferiora ſuperioribus contumaciter reluctantur, etiamſi vincere non ſinantur.*

[h] *De peccat. merit. & remiſ. lib. 2. cap. 17. Ignorantia & infirmitas vitia ſunt, quæ impediunt voluntatem ne moueatur ad faciendum opus bonum vel ab opere malo abſtinendum.*

[i] *De nat. & grat. cap. 67. Omni peccanti animæ duo iſta pœnalia, ignorantia & difficultas.*

## 8. W. Bishop.

Aug. Epiſt. 29.

M. Perkins 4. *reaſon is taken from the record of the ancient Church*: Charitie in ſome is more, in ſome leſſe, in ſome none, the higheſt degree of all which cannot bee increaſed, is in none, as long as a man liues vpon earth: & as long as it may be increaſed, that which is leſſe then it ſhould be, is in fault: by which fault it is, that there is no iuſt man vpon earth, that doth good and ſinneth not, &c. For which alſo though we profit neuer ſo much, it is neceſſarie for vs to ſay, Forgiue vs our debts, though all our worſt deedes and thoughts be alreadie forgiuen in Baptiſme. *Anſwer. That heere is neuer a word touching concupiſcence, or to prooue Originall ſinne to remaine after*

*ter Baptiſme, which is in queſtion: but onely that the beſt men for want of perfect charity, do often ſinne venially, which we graunt.*

## R. Abbot.

*S. Auſtin* ſaith, that [a] *perfect charity which can now no further be increaſed, is in no man ſo long as he liueth here. And ſo long as it may be increaſed,* ſaith he, *ſurely that that it is leſſe then it ſhould be,* Exvitio est, *is by reaſon of ſome vice, corruption, default. M. Biſhop* anſwereth, that *here is neuer a word of concupiſcence, or to proue Originall ſinne to remaine after Baptiſme.* But if he had meant honeſtly, he ſhould haue told vs what is meant by that *vitium*, call it *vice* or *blemiſh*, or *ſtaine*, or *corruption*, or *default*, or all theſe. If it bee not vnderſtood of *concupiſcence* and the continuing blot and ſtaine of Originall ſinne, he ſhould haue told vs what we are otherwiſe to vnderſtand by it. But he could deuiſe nothing elſe whereof to vnderſtand it, and therefore is content with a very homely and beggarly ſhift to paſſe it ouer, that forſooth there is nothing ſaid of *concupiſcence*, when yet that that is ſaid cannot bee meant of any thing elſe. And that it is ſo meant, S. *Auſtin* himſelfe plainly confirmeth vnto vs by the like ſentence in another place. [b] *If in Abel* (ſaith he) *there were wherein the loue of God might and ought to be increaſed, that that was too little, ex vitio erat, was by reaſon of ſome vice or corruption.* And this he ſheweth to be the ſame that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of when he ſaith, *Let not ſinne raigne in your mortall bodies, &c.* This ſinne he tearmeth *vitium*, and ſaith: [c] *By this vice or corruption the eye is caſt whither it ought not to be, and if it go forward and preuaile, adultery is committed.* Againe he addeth, *Hoc peccatum, id eſt, hunc vitioſæ affectionis appetitum, qui magna ex parte frenarunt, &c. This ſinne, that is to ſay, this luſt of vitious affection, they who haue for the moſt part bridled, haue deſerued to be called iuſt.* And thus very often he calleth *concupiſcence a vice*, and the motions thereof *vices*, as before was ſaid. Now in the place cited, S. *Auſtin* addeth, as touching the effect of this *vice*: [d] *By reaſon of which vice there is not a iuſt man vpon earth, that doth good and ſinneth not. By reaſon of which vice no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified or found iuſt in the ſight of God. By reaſon of which vice, if we ſay wee haue no ſinne, wee deceiue our ſelues, &c.* Which two latter clauſes *M. Biſhop* very vnecherouſly and falſly hath

a *Auguſt. Epiſt. 29. Plenißima charitas quæ iam non poſſit augeri, quamdiu hic homo viuit. eſt in nemine: quamdiu autẽ augeri poteſt, profecto illud quod minus eſt quàm debet, ex vitio eſt.*

b *De na. & gra. cap. 38. Si in Abel iuſto charitas Dei adhuc erat, quo poſſet & deberet augeri, quicquid minus erat, ex vitio erat.*

c *Ex hoc vitio mittitur et dimittatur oculus quo non oportet.*

d *Epiſt. 29. Ex quo vitio non eſt iuſtus ſuper terram, &c. Ex quo vitio non iuſtificabitur, &c.*

hath left out: becauſe he ſaw them wholy contrary to all that hee ſaith. For if by reaſon of this vice of concupiſcence, wee cannot ſay that we haue no ſinne, then it muſt needs follow that concupiſcence is truly *ſin*. If by reaſon of this *vice, no man liuing ſhall bee found iuſt in the ſight of God*, thē this *vice*, that is to ſay, *concupiſcence*, is *ſin*, becauſe nothing hindreth a man from being iuſt in the ſight of God but onely ſinne. And this taketh away the other part of his anſwer, that S. *Auſtine* onely ſaith, that *the beſt men for want of perfect charity doe often ſinne venially*. For by their doctrine, *veniall ſins* hinder not a man from being iuſt in the ſight of God, whereas the *vice* of which S. *Auſtin* ſpeaketh, is ſuch as hindereth iuſtice, ſo that by reaſon thereof no man liuing ſhall be found iuſt in the ſight of God. *M. Perkins* therefore rightly alledged this place, to proue that concupiſcence is *ſinne*, and *M. Biſhop* in anſwering it, ſheweth himſelfe a man of wretched and euil conſcience, who being ſo ſhut in with the truth, as that he knew not which way to reſiſt, yet wold rather by falſhood and colluſion ſhift it off, then renounce the errors, to the maintenance whereof he hath wickedly ſold himſelfe.

9. W. BISHOP.

M. Perkins *hauing thus ſtrongly (as you ſee) fortified his poſition with that one ſentence of S.* Auguſtine (*which hath alſo nothing for his purpoſe*) *in ſteede of all antiquitie: confeſſeth ingenuouſly, that* S. Auguſtine *in ſundry places denieth concupiſcence to be ſinne: but expounds him to meane, that it is not ſinne in that perſon, but in it ſelfe: which is already confuted: for ſinne that is an accident, and ſo properly inherent in his ſubiect, cannot be at all, if it be not in ſome perſon and the ſinne of the ſame perſon. But if the Proteſtant Reader deſire to bee well aſſured of* S. Auguſtines *opinion in this point: let him ſee what their Patriarch* Iohn Caluin *ſaith of it: where thus he writeth:* Neither is it needfull to labour much in ſearching out what the old Writers thought of this point, when one *Auguſtine* may ſerue the turn: who with great diligence hath faithfully collected together all their ſentences. Let the readers therfore take out of him, if they deſire to haue any certainty of the iudgement of antiquity. *Hitherto ſomewhat honeſtlie: What followeth?* Moreouer betweene him and vs, there is this difference: that hee truely dares not call the diſeaſe of concupiſcence a ſinne, but to expreſſe it, is content to vſe the word of infirmity, then

Lib. 3. Inſtit. cap 3. num. 10.

doe doth he say, that it is made sinne, when the act of our consent doth ioyne with it. But we shall that very thing to be sinne, wherewith a man is in any sort tickled. *Obserue first, good Reader, what* S. Augustines *opinion was to him earieth the Creed of all antiquity. Which is the cause that I cite him not often against them. Secondly, that he is flatly on our side: teaching concupiscence not to be sinne, vnlesse we doe consent vnto it. Lastly learne to mistrust the blind boldnesse of such Masters: who hauing so highly commended* S. Augustines *iudgement in this very matter, and aduised all men to follow it, dare notwithstanding flie from it himselfe: presuming that some would be so shallow witted as not espie him, or else content to rely more vpon his onely credit, then vpon the authority of all the auncient Fathers. For a taste of whose consent with* S. Augustine *in this question, I will here put the sentences of some few, that I neede not hereafter returne to rehearse them.*

*S. Chrysostome* saith, Passions be not sinnes of themselues, but the vnbridled excesse of them doth make sinne. And that I may for example sake touch one of them: Concupiscence is not a sinne; but when passing measure it breakes his bounds, then loe it is adultery; not in regard of concupiscence, but in respect of the excessiue and vnlawfull riot of it. *Homil 11. in epist ad Rom.*

S. Bernard (*whom M.* Perkins *often vseth against vs, and therefore may sometimes be alledged for vs*) saith these words: Sin is at the dore, but if thou doe not open it, it will not enter in: lust tickleth at the heart: but vnlesse thou willingly yeeld vnto it, it shall doe thee no hurt: withhold thy consent, and it preuaileth not. *Serm de sex. tribul.*

S. Aug. *and* S. Cirill, *haue bene cited already,* S. Hier. *and* S. Greg. *shall be hereafter: who with the confession of* Caluine *may serue sufficiently to proue, that approued antiquity is wholy for vs. And if any desire to know the founder of our aduersaries Doctrine in this point, let him read the 64. heresie recorded by that ancient and holy Bishop* Epiphanius: *where he registreth one* Proclus *an old rotten sectary to haue taught, that sinnes are not taken away in Baptisme, but are onely couered, which is as much to say, as sinne remaineth still in the person regenerate, but is not imputed to him. Which is iust M.* Perkins *and our Protestants position.*

R. ABBOT.

If *M. Perkins* had no better fortified his positions, then *M. Bishop* doth his answers, he should with vs haue bin holden for too weake

a man to meddle in controuerſies of diuinity. But as *Tertullian* ſaid, that [a] *it is no where more eaſie thriuing thē in the camp of rebels, where to be only, is to be in pay*, ſo may we ſay, that it is no where more eaſie writing then amongſt hereticks and rebels againſt the truth, where to write onely is ſufficient to commend a man; it is no matter how or what hee write. Such a writer is *M. Biſhop*: a bad one, God knowes: but we can look for no better of him then the matter wil affoord him. He ſaith, that *M. Perkins* had but one ſentence of S. *Auſtine* for the maintenance of his poſition, and that nothing for his purpoſe: but M. *Perkins* hath alledged more then he hath anſwered, and it ſeemeth, that that one ſentence was to the purpoſe, which he could no otherwiſe ſhift off, but by leud diſſembling and concealing of that, wherein S. *Auſtine* with maine ſtreame doth runne againſt him. Againe he telleth vs, that M. *Perkins confeſſeth ingenuouſly, that S. Auguſtine in ſundry places denieth concupiſcence to be ſin*, and we confeſſe as much, and expound S. *Auſtines* meaning as he doth, that *it is not ſinne to the perſon*, not that in it ſelfe it is not *ſinne. But this*, he ſaith, *is already confuted*, and we ſay that his imagined confutation is already reconfuted. But he giueth vs a reaſon why it cannot be ſo. *For ſinne that is an accident, and ſo properly inherent in his ſubiect, cannot be at all, if it be not in ſome perſon, & the ſin of the ſame perſon.* And we anſwer him by S. *Auſtine*, that it is *ſinne* in the perſon, and *the ſinne of the perſon* by inherent quality and diſpoſition, but it is not *the ſinne of the perſon* by account of guilt and imputation. For the approouing whereof *M. Perkins* alledged two places out of *Auſtine*, which *M. Biſhop* honeſtly paſſeth ouer, as if hee had not ſeene them, but they will meete with him againe anon. In the meane time he bringeth vs in our *Patriark*, as he calleth him, *Iohn Caluin*, referring his Readers to S. *Auſtin*, to know by him the iudgement of antiquity, concerning this matter of concupiſcence. Where I anſwere him, that we honour *Calun* indeede as a ſingular inſtrument of God, for the reſtoring of the light of his truth, and ouerthrowing of the throne of the purple whoore of Rome, but we make him no patriarch, wee follow him no further then he approoueth vnto vs, that he is a follower of Chriſt: wee tie not our ſelues to him, but vſe our liberty to diſſent from him, and to cenſure him where hee hath gone awry. But *M. Biſhop* and his fellowes haue their Patriarch indeede, to whom they binde themſelues

[a] *Tertul. de præſcript. Nuſquam facilius proficitur quam in caſtris rebellium, vbi ipſis eſſe illic promereri eſt.*

selues, Antichrist the man of sinne, the enemie of Christ, whose dirt they must bee content to eate, and to brooke all the filth of his abhominations, and [a] *though hee leade them to hell, yet no man may dare say vnto him, Sir why doe yee so?* Well, *Caluin* saith, that *Austine* hath diligently gathered the iudgement of antiquitie, and what then? forsooth hee saith further thus: that [b] *betweene Austine and vs there may seeme to bee this difference, that he dares not call the disease of concupiscence by the name of sinne; but we hold it to bee a sinne that a man is tickled with any lust or desire against the law of God.* Whereupon *M. Bishop* giueth his Reader these obseruations; first that *S. Austines opinion varieth with Caluin the credite of all antiquity, which is the cause,* saith hee, *that I cite him more often against them*; which indeede hee hath full clerkly and profoundly done, so as that I presume, I may assure the Reader that hee hath scarsely euer read ouer one booke of his. *Secondly,* saith he, *that he is flatly one our side:* but therein hee reckoneth before his host; for *Caluin* saith to the contrarie, that [c] *Austine differeth not so much from our doctrine, as in shew hee seemeth to doe, and that hee varieth but little from our opinion. Lastly,* saith hee, *learne to* mislike *the blind boldnesse of such masters.* But if *Caluin* were blind, alasse for poore *M. Bishop*, what can he see? and yet though hee can see but little, hee is as bold as blind bayard, and doubteth not to vilifie him, to whom he might verie well be a scholler yet many yeeres. *Caluin* iustlie commendeth *Austins* iudgment, and aduiseth all men to follow it, and in substance flieth not from it himselfe, though in termes hee somewhat differ. Neither did hee presume vpon *shallow wits* not to bee espied, knowing well that the whole rabble of the court of Antichrist, would vse their deepest wits for the sifting of that hee should write, but in the conscience of integritie and faithfulnesse, he despised all their barkings and malitious furie, and with the inuincible sheeld of truth beareth off all the poisoned darts of their reproches. Hee neuer taught men to rely vpon his authoritie, but by authority of the word of God and testimonie of the auncient Church, he laboured to establish the faith of Christ, yet making men witnesses onely, not authours or dictators of the truth, and therefore not doubting to censure them, where they swarue from the authoritie of the word of truth. But now because *M. Bishop* will perswade vs, that *S. Austine* is wholly on their part, let vs somewhat more at large examine his opinion

a *Dist. 40. ſi. Papa.*

b *Caluin. Institut. li. 3. ca. 3. sect. 10.*

c *Ibid. sect. 11.*

and iudgement in this behalfe. Which although it may bee sufficiently perceiued by those things that haue beene scatteringlie alledged already, yet fully to remoue this cauill, let vs here lay together what shall be found necessarie for the clearing thereof. And first, we are to obserue, that *sinne* is considered two manner of waies; one way as it is opposed to *righteousnesse*, another way as it is opposed to *forgiuenesse of sinne*. Sinne properly taken, as euerie mans vnderstanding giueth him, is opposite to *righteousnesse*, and so whatsoeuer is contrarie to righteousnesse, is *sinne*. Thus haue we before described the nature of *sinne*, and according to this description *concupiscence* in the regenerate, beeing [c] *contrary* to righteousnesse is *sinne*, neither euer came it into *S. Austines* heart to thinke otherwise. But he considereth *sinne* in the proper effect of *sinne*, as it maketh *guilty*, so that whatsoeuer is *forgiuen* is no *sinne*, because *forgiuenesse* taketh away the *guilt* of *sinne*. So long as the *guilt* remaineth, though the thing bee past and gone, wherof or whereby the man is *guilty*, yet he vnderstandeth the *sinne* to remaine still. If the *guilt* bee taken away, though the thing still continue the same, by which the man became *guilty*, yet hee taketh it not to bee in the nature of *sinne*, because the nature of *sinne* is to make *guilty*. The occasion of which construction was giuen him by the Pelagian heretickes, the predecessours of the Papists, who when hee taught against them Originall sinne, and the remainder of that blot of naturall corruption in the regenerate, as we doe, tooke occasion to cauill against him, that hee [e] *said, that baptisme did not giue remission of all sinnes, neither did take away faults, but onely shaue them, so as that the rootes were still sticking, from whence other sinnes should grow againe.* *S. Austine* the better to cleare this matter to popular vnderstanding, affirmeth, that baptisme doth take away *all sinne*, because that albeit *concupiscence of the flesh* were still remaining, yet it did not remaine in the nature of *sinne*, because the *guilt* there of in baptisme was remitted. [f] *It is forgiuen*, saith hee, *not so as that it is not, but so as that it is not imputed for sinne.* [g] *In the regenerate, when they receiue forgiueneſſe of all their sinnes, the guilt of this concupiscence, though*

d Rom. 7. 23. Gal. 5. 17.

c *August. contra duas epist. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 3. Dicitur inquit, baptisma non dare omnem indulgentiam peccatorum nec auferre crimina sed radere, vt omnium peccatorū radices in mala carne teneantur, quasi rasorum in capite capillorum, vnde crescant iterum rescindā peccata*

e *De nupt. et concupisc. lib. 1. ca. 25. Dimittetur non vt non sit, sed vt in peccatum non imputetur.*

f *Ibid. cap. 26. In eis qui regenerantur in Christo, cum remissionem accipiunt prorsus omnium peccatorum vtique necesse est, vt reatus etiam huius licet manentis adhuc concupiscentiæ remittatur, vt in peccatū non imputetur. Nam sicut eorum peccatorum, quæ manere non possūt quoniam cum fiūt præterierunt, reatus tamen manet, et nisi remittatur in æternum manebit: sic illius concupiscentiæ quando remittitur reatus auferetur. Hoc est enim non habere peccatum, non esse reum peccati. Nam si quisquam verbi gratia se teretadulterium et iam si nunquam deinceps faciat, reus est adulterij donec reatus ipsius indulgentia remittatur. Habet ergo peccatum, quamuis illud quod admisit iam non sit, quia cum tempore suo factum est præterijt, & Manent ergo peccata si remittantur. Sed quomodo manent si præterijt sunt nisi quia præterierunt actu, manent reatu? Sic itaque fieri è contrario potest vt etiam illud maneat actu præterreat reatu.*

g

it ſelfe ſtill continue, is remitted ſo as that it is not imputed for ſinne. For as of thoſe ſins which cannot continue, becauſe when they are done they are paſt, yet the guilt ſtill abideth, and except it be pardoned, ſhall abide for euer: ſo the guilt of concupiſcence when it is pardoned, is taken away, though it ſelfe abide. For not to haue ſinne is all one as to ſay, not to bee guiltie of ſinne. He that hath committed adultery, though he doe it no more, is ſtill guilty till he be pardoned. Therefore he hath his ſinne ſtill, though that which he hath committed now is not in being, being paſt with the time wherein it was done. Such ſinnes therefore remaine except they be forgiuen. But how doe they remaine being now paſt, but becauſe they are paſt as touching their actuall being, but remaine ſtill as touching the guilt? Euen ſo, ſaith he, it may well be, that concupiſcence of the fleſh remaineth ſtill as touching the actuall being, but yet as touching the guilt is paſt and gone He calleth this concupiſcence [h] a damnable pollution & vncleannes, wherewith the nature of man is defiled, and for which it is condemned. And he ſaith thereof, that [i] not the euill it ſelfe, but the guilt that is gathered thereof, is taken away in baptiſme; that this ſinne is [k] dead, as touching the guilt wherein it held vs: that [l] the guilt ther- of which we haue drawne by generation, is pardoned by regeneration, & therfore now it is not ſinne. Thus when Iulian obiected to him, that if concupiſcence were euill, then the babtiſed ſhould be without it, he an- ſwereth, that [m] the baptiſed is voided of all ſinne, not of all euill. Which ſaith he, is more plainely ſpoken thus, He is voide of the guilt of all euil, not of all that is euill, affirming the guilt onely to be taken away, but that the euill that before made him guilty, remaineth ſtill. Therefore he ſaith, that [n] concupiſcence is not called ſinne, in ſuch manner as ſinne maketh guiltie, becauſe the guilt thereof is releaſed in the Sacrament of regeneration. The places are infinite, wherein hee ſpeaketh to the ſame effect, that [o] the law of ſinne. the bond of the guilt thereof be- ing looſed, continueth ſtill: that [p] the law of concupiſcence is ſtill abi- ding, but the guilt thereof is releaſed: that [q] God healeth the corrupti on of man, from the guilt forthwith, but from the infirmity by little and litle: that [r] the law of ſin is remitted and pardoned in baptiſme, but not ended: that [s] the vices of concupiſcence are cured by the grace of Chriſt, that they hold vs not in guilt, but that they remaine for vs to fight with and conquer, and laſt of all, to bee perfectly healed:

h Ibid.cap.23. Propter damnabi- le vitium, quo viti- ata eſt natura hu- mana damnatur.

i Contra Iulian. Pelag.lib.2.Eſt in homine aliquid malũ, quod non ip- ſum ſed reatus qui ex illo contractus fuerat, auferetur in Baptiſmo.

k Ibid. Mortuum eſt in eo reatu quo nos tenebat.

l Contra duas Epiſtolas Pelag. lib. 1.cap.13.Reatus, eius generatione tractus, regenera- tione dimiſſus eſt: & ideo iam non eſt peccatum.

m Contr. Iulian. lib.6.cap.5.Bap- tizatus caret om- ni peccato, nõ om- ni malo: quod pla- nius ita dicitur, caret reatu omnium malorum, non om- nibus malis.

n Ibid.lib.2.Non eodem modo ap- pellatur peccatum quo facit reũ, & priùs: Cuius ma- nenti reatu in ſacro fonte remiſ- ſus eſt.

o De peccat. mer. & remiſſ.lib.1: cap.39.Ipſa lex peccati ſoluto rea- tus vinculo ma- net.&c.

p Ibid.lib.2.cap. 28. Manente ipſa lege concupiſcen- tiæ reatus eius ſol- uitur.

q Cont. Iulian.lib. 2.Sanet vitiatum à reatu ſtatim ab infirmitate paulatim.

r Ibid. Remittitur in Baptiſmate lex peccati, non finitur.

s Ibid.lib.5.cap.5.Vitia iſta curantur, priùs vt reatu non teneant, deinde vt conflictu non vincant: poſtremò vt omni exparte ſanata nulla omnino remaneant.

*not to be at all*, ſtill beating vpon this, that there is ſtill remaining the ſame thing that was before, the *law of ſin* before, the *law of ſin* ſtill: *euill* before, *euill* ſtill: *a vice* or *corruption* before, *a vice* and *corruption* ſtill, onely the *guilt* taken away, and thereby onely denied to be *ſin*. Now in this we contend not with *Auſtin*, nor *Auſtin* with vs: we ſhall eaſily accord with him, that concupiſcence in the regenerate is not *ſinne*, as *ſinne* importeth and implieth *guilt*, becauſe the *guilt* thereof is remitted and pardoned. But ſeeing aſide the reſpect of *guilt*, and conſidering *ſinne* as it is oppoſite to righteouſnes, doth he in that reſpect acquit *concupiſcence* from the condition of *ſinne*? No verily: for he acknowledgeth, that [t] *though it be not called ſinne in that ſort, as that it maketh guilty*, yet it is called *ſinne, for that by rebelling it laboureth to draw vs into guilt*. And when *Iulian* the Pelagian tooke hold of that that he ſaid, that *concupiſcence and rebellion of the fleſh, was iuſtly laid as a puniſhment vpon the diſobedience of man*, and hereupon argued that then it *was no euil but rather a thing to be commended, as Gods ſeruant for reuenge vpon him that had deſerued it*, to refute his collection, anſwereth, that it is not onely *the puniſhment of ſinne*, or *the cauſe of ſinne*, but alſo very *ſinne* it ſelfe, [u] *becauſe there is in it a rebellion againſt the law of the mind*, and therefore that vainely he inferred, that *concupiſcence becauſe it was a puniſhment was to be commended*. Where to ſay that S. *Auſtin* taketh *ſin* vnproperly, as *M. Biſhop* doth, is to make him to ſpeak very abſurdly if we conſider the occaſion whereupon he ſpeaketh. But to ſhew, that *concupiſcence* though in reſpect of *guilt* it be not *ſin*, yet otherwile it is truly ſo, he calleth it in the regenerate [x] *a pardoned ſin, a ſin conquered & deſtroyed*; [y] *a ſin forgiuen, couered, not imputed*: and out of *S. Ambroſe* [z] *a dead ſin, becauſe* (ſaith he) *it is dead as touching the guilt wherein it held vs, & being dead yet rebelleth vntil by accompliſhment of burial it be healed*. So then as touching *guilt* it is conquered, deſtroyed dead, and it is not *ſin*, but *by rebellion* it ſtil liueth, & therin it is truely *ſin*. And therefore doth he paint it out euen in the regenerate, with ſuch names and termes, as do plainely convict it to be *ſinne*. He calleth it [a] *vice, luſt of vitious affection*, [b] *vitious concupiſcence*, [c] *vitiouſnes or corruption*, and what doth vitiate, defile, corrupt the ſoule, but onely ſinne? He calleth it [d] *a diſeaſe, a diſeaſed affection of the fleſh, a peſtilence*, [e] *a wound and contagious filth*, and what other

t *Contr. Iulian. lib. 2. Non codē modo appellatur peccatū quo factū reum. ſed quod ſit reatus primi hominis factū, & quod rebellando nos trahere nititur ad reatum.*

u *Contr. Iulian. lib 5. cap. 3. ſupr. ſect. 7.*

x *De pecca. mer. & remiſ. lib. 2. cap. 28 Peccatum remiſſū ſuperatū, peremptum.*

y *De nupt. & cōcup. lib. 1. ca. 33. Peccatum illud quod remiſſum & tectum eſt, & non imputatur. Et lib. 2. cap. 34.*

z *Contr. Iulian. li. 2. Quia mortuū eſt in eo reatu quo nos tenebat, & domec ſepulture perfectione ſanetur, rebellat & mortuum.*

a *De nat. & gr. cap. 38. Vitium, vitioſæ affectionis appetitum.*

b *De nupt. & cōcup. li. 2. cap. 31. Vitioſa concupiſcentia.*

c *Epiſt. 54. Ab omni vitioſitate.*

d *De nupt. & con. lib. 1 cap. 29. In hoc morbo. Et cap. 31. Vbi eſt morbidus carnis affectus Ab ea peſte morboque ſanata.*

e *De Temp. Ser. 45 Vulnus tabē. Et contr. Iul. lib. 6. cap. 7. Quodam operante contagio, id eſt, concupiſcentiæ affectu.*

diſeaſe

diſeaſe, or peſtilẽce, or wound & contagiõ of man is there ſpiritually but only *ſinne*? He calleth *this law of ſin* [f] *a filthy law, a miſerable law*, not for that it hath a being by it ſelfe to be filthy and miſerable; but becauſe we by it are in our ſelues *filthy and miſerable*, which nothing can cauſe but onely *ſinne*. He calleth it [g] *an euill, euill concupiſcence, an euill qualty, an affection of euill quality*, and what euill qualty is there of the ſoule, what ſpirituall euil, but onely ſin? Hee calleth the firſt motions and affections thereof [h] *inward vices, vice borne and bred in vs, vices from the guilt whereof we are freed, fooliſh and hurtful deſires*, [i] *vitious deſires, euill and filthy deſires*, [k] *vnlawfull concupiſcences*, and how do theſe termes agree to them if they be no *ſinne*? He calleth it [l] *a luſtfull diſobedience*, and ſaith that [m] *it is an iniquity that the fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit: though the guilt thereof be acquitted and all* [n] *diſobedience and* [o] *iniquitie is ſinne*. Hee ſaith, that [p] *there is euill in an euil deſire, though a man conſent not to it for euil*. And whereas there are two ſorts of *euils*, [q] mala peccatoria & vltoria *euils of ſin and euils of puniſhment and reuenge*, that wee may know that in naming *concupiſcence euill*, he meaneth an euill *of ſinne*: he citeth the words of *Hilarie*, that [r] *though the Apoſtles were cleanſed and ſanctified by the word of faith, yet our Sauiour teacheth, that there was not wanting in them euilneſſe, iſneſſe by the condition of our common originall, in that he ſaith, If you being* euill *do know to giue good gifts vnto your children*. Where very euidently we are taught, that of *Original ſinne* there remaineth ſtill in the regenerate ſuch an euill, as wherby they are ſtill *euill*: ſo that though they be [s] *good by participation of the grace of God, yet they be ſtill euill by reaſon of the vices of humane infirmity, till all be healed* à vitioſitate, *from corruption*, &c. Now thogh ſometimes the name of *euill* be otherwiſe vſed then of *ſinne* yet neuer is a man called *euill* by any *euill*, but that that is *ſin*. Croſſes and afflictions are euils, but by theſe euils, or for theſe euils, no man is called *euill*. But concupiſcence is ſuch an *euill*, as whereby a man is *euill*, and for which the regenerate man is ſtill truly called *euill*: and therefore is a *ſinfull euill*; an *euill* that is truely and properly *a ſinne*. Therefore Saint *Auſtine* maketh it *an euill* in the ſame kind and

f *De Tempt. ibid. Legem fiedam, legẽ miſeram.*
g *Contr. Iulian. lib. 6. cap. 5. An non eſt malũ? quis neget eſſe malam? E. ibid cap. 7. Qualitas mala. De nup. & concupiſ. l. 1. ca. 25. Affectio malæ qualitatis.*
h *Contr. Iulian. lib. 2. Ciuile bellũ interiorum vitiorũ. Aduerſus inueterata vitia bellum geruit.*
i *Vitia a quorum reatu abſoluti ſumus. Deſideria ſtulta & noxia.*
k *De nupt. & concup. lib. 1. ca 25. Vitioſa deſiderii. Et cap. 27. Deſideria mala & turpia.*
l *In Ioan. Tr. 41. Fili tibi a concupiſcentia in carne tua.*
m *De ciuit. Dei lib. 1. cap. 25. Illa concupiſcentialis inobedientia, quæ in moribundis membris habitat.*
n *Contr. Iulian. lib. 2. & lib. 6. cap. 8 ſupr. ſect. 7.*
o *Rom. 5. 19. & 1. Joh. 1. 17.*
p *Contr. Iulian. lib. 4. cap. 2. Deſiderii malũ malum eſt, etiamſi ei non conſentiatur.*
q *Tertul. cont. Marcion. lib. 2.*
r *Contr. Iulian.*

*lib. 1. ex Hilar. in Pſal. 118 Sanctè Ipſi Apoſtoli verbo licet fidei iam emundatis atque ſanctificatis, non deeſſe tamen malitiam per conditionem communis nobis originis docuit, dicens, Si vos cùm ſitis mali, &c. Epiſt. 54. Ipſe Dominus quos dicit bonos propter participationem gratiæ diuinæ, eoſdem etiam malos dicit propter vitia infirmitatis humanæ, donec totum quo conſtamus ab omni vitioſitate ſanatum tranſeat in eam vitam, vbi nihil omnino peccabitur.*

nature, as *ſinne* is *euill* when he ſaith, [t] *Who is ſo madde, as that confeſſing ſinnes to be euill, he will deny the concupiſcence of ſinnes to be euil, albeit by reaſon of the ſpirit luſting againſt it, it be not ſuffered to conceiue and bring foorth ſinnes?* And to take away all exception, and at once to ſtrike the matter dead, he addeth that *it is ſuch and ſo great an euill, as that onely for being in vs, it ſhould hold vs in death, & draw vs to euerlaſting death, but that the bond thereof is looſed in baptiſme by the forgiueneſſe of all our ſinnes*; euen as he had ſaid a little before, *that it ſhould not only be in the faithfull, but alſo greeuouſly hurt them, but that the guilt thereof which had bound vs, is looſed by the forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes.* Which onely words might ſuffice to declare vnto vs S. *Auſtines* mind, that he neuer thought, but that *concupiſcence* is *ſinne* in that meaning, wherein we here diſpute of *ſinne*. For if it bee ſuch an euill, as that ſaue onely that the *guilt* thereof is pardoned it ſhould greatly hurt vs, and ſo hurt vs, as that it ſhould *draw vs vnto euerlaſting death*, it cannot be denied to be truely *ſinne*, becauſe nothing could bring vs to euerlaſting death, but onely *ſinne*. And yet more fully to ſhew this, and to prooue againſt *Iulian* the blot and ſtaine of Originall ſinne remaining after baptiſme, he alledgeth further out of Hilary, [u] *that we cannot be cleane in the tabernacle of this earthly and carion body*; [x] *that our bodies are the matter of all vices, by reaſon whereof being polluted and defiled, we haue nothing in vs innocent, nothing cleane*, not as to condemne the *ſubſtance* of the bodie, but [y] *vitium ſubſtantiæ, the vitious quality of the ſubſtance*, and to ſignifie that therewith we ſtill continue in part ſtained and defiled, ſo long as we cõtinue vpon the earth. Now there is nothing whereby we are *vncleane, polluted, defiled*, but onely *ſinne*. Seeing therfore by the remainder of *Originall ſinne*, that is, by *concupiſcence* we continue after baptiſme *vnclean, polluted & defiled*, it followeth neceſſarily, that *concupiſcence* after baptiſm is properly and truly *ſinne*. And if concupiſcence be not ſinne without conſent, then by S. *Auſtines* iudgement the Apoſtles muſt be ſaid to liue without ſinne. For he affirmeth of them, that they were [z] *free from any conſent to euil luſts*, meaning it after they had receiued that great meaſure of the holie Ghoſt. And ſo much he affirmeth particularly of the Apoſtle [a] *Paul*. But to affirme that the Apoſtles were free from ſinne, is [b] contrary to the doctrin of *S. Auſtine*. Concupiſcence therfore by *S. Auſtins*

t *Cont. Iulian. lib. 6. ca. 5. Quis ita inſanus & demẽs, qui cùm peccata mala eſſe fateatur neget eſſe malam concupiſcentiam peccatorum, etiam ſi aduerſus eam concupiſcente ſpiritu peccata concipere ac parere non ſinatur? Tale porrò ac tam magnum malum, tantum quia eſt, quomodo non teneret in morte, & perſtraberet in vltimam mortem, niſi & eius vinculum in illa quæ fit in baptiſmo peccatorum omnium remiſſione ſolueretur?*

u *Contra Julian. lib. 2. ex Hilar. in Pſal. 118. Gimel. Nos in hoc terreni & morticini corporis habitaculo mundos eſſe non poſſe.*

x *Ibid. ex homil. quadam de lib. ſancti Iob. Memores & conſcij illa ipſa corpora vitiorum omnium eſſe materiem, pro qua polluti & ſordidi nihil in nobis mundum, nihil innocens obtinemus.*

y *Ibid. pugnandi neceſſitas contra malum, non ſubſtantiam, ſed ſubſtantiæ vitium.*

z *Contr. duas Epiſt. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 11. Apoſtolos dicimus à prauarum libidinum conſenſione liberos*

&c. a *In Ioan. tract. 41. Faciebat vt concupiſcentia non conſentiret. Vide Bernard. in Cantic. Ser. 36.* b *De nat. & grat. cap. 36. Omnes ſancti ſi interrogari potuiſſent vna voce clamaſſent, ſi dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, &c.*

iudgement

iudgement muſt neceſſarily bee ſinne. And hereto agree alſo the iudgements of the reſt of the Fathers. *Cyprian* calleth it in the regenerate [c] *a corruption, the furnace of Babylon, a domeſticall euill, of which they will be aſhamed, who deſire with pure heart to ſee the king in his beautie: a raging beaſt of ſtinking breath, to bee tied vp with iron chaines in the vtmoſt paſſages of the ſoule.* Hee ſaith againe of the [d] *holy Prophets and Prieſts, that they wanted neither Originall nor perſonall ſinne*, and thereby confeſſeth that in holy men *Originall ſinne* continueth ſtill. *Ambroſe* calleth *concupiſcence* euen in the regenerate; [e] *a defilement of nature, iniquitie, the worker of default and treſpaſſe, the ſeed plot of ſinnes, an euill roote, an affection of errour.* *Bernard* in the like ſort, calleth it [f] *a contamination, a blot, a contagion, a peſtilent poyſon, a manifold peſtilence, the cheriſhment of all naughtineſſe, a furnace ſtrongly burning with the affections of ambition, auarice, enuie, wilfulneſſe, lewdneſſe, and all vices.* Hee againe maketh it euen by it ſelfe, [g] *a wall*, which ſo long as it is in vs *excludeth and ſhutteth vs out from God*; as of *Paul* for example he ſaith, that *this one wall hindred his ſoule from the ſight and embracing of his beloued Sauiour.* By all which the Reader may eſteeme, what conſciences they had in the Councell of Trent, that ſet it downe to the world as an article to be beleeued, that *concupiſcence* is [h] *not a thing that God hateth*, that *it is not a thing that hindreth from entring into heauen.* Theſe ſpeeches cannot bee thus applied to anie thing but ſinne. We haue no cauſe to *be aſhamed* of any thing before God but onely ſinne. God cannot but hate all *corruption, all filthineſſe*, all *iniquitie*, all *contagion* and vncleanneſſe of the ſoule, and ſeeing concupiſcence is a *wall* that ſhutteth vs out from God, it muſt needs be ſinne, becauſe nothing can diuide vs from God but onely *ſinne.* Now therefore as touching the two places which *M. Biſhop* citeth in the ſecond ſection, wherein *S. Auſtin* denieth concupiſcence to be *ſinne*, the anſwer is plaine by *Auſtin* himſelfe: [i] *Quia remiſſa eſt in remiſſione peccatorum, non iam regeneratis in peccatum reputatur: becauſe it is forgiuen to the regenerate by remiſſion of ſinnes, it is not now reputed to them for ſinne.* It is *ſinne* in it owne nature, but becauſe the guilt thereof is pardoned, therefore and in that reſpect onely it is not accounted ſinne.

[c] *Cypri. de rat. circumciſ. Huius contagio corruptele; Babylonie fornax, domeſticum malum, de quo erubeſcent quicunque mundo corde regem in decore ſuo videre deſiderant: inſaniem beſtiæ corruptæ ambelatus, catenis ferreis in vltimis animæ receſſibus alliganda.*

[d] *Idem de ieiun. et tent. Chriſti. Nec originalis nec perſonali caruere delicto.*

[e] *Ambroſ. de Apol. Dauid. ca. 11. Deploraui in ſe Dauid inquinamenta naturæ. Et ibid. cap. 13. Iniquitas: operatrix culpæ & delicti: radix & ſeminarium peccatorum, mala radix affectus erroris.*

[f] *Bern. de ſex tribulat. Quod in homine purum ab hac macula, immune ab hoc contagio poterit inueniri? Tribulatio dum reſiſtitur contaminationi, concupiſcentiæ repugnatur. De corde exit peſtiferum virus. Huic multifariæ peſti reſiſtere. Fomes tot tam nequitiæ. Fornax ambitionis, &c. omnium denique vitiorum affectibus vehementer accenſa.*

[g] *Bernar. in Cant. ſer. 56. Pauli animæ ab aſpectu & complexu dilecti vnus tantum modo paries obſiſtebat, videlicet lex peccati. Ipſa eſt carnis concupiſcentia, &c. paries primus concupiſcentiæ: ſecundus conſenſus, &c.*

[h] *Concil. Triden. Seſſ. 5. In renatis nihil quod odit Deus, nihil ab ingreſſu cœli remoratur.*

[i] *De nupt. & Concupiſ. lib. 2. cap. 34.*

And

And hereby the anſwer is plaine to that other cauill which they borrow alſo from S. *Auſtin*, that [k] *for concupiſcence or the deſires and motions thereof, we do not ſay forgiue vs our treſpaſſes ſo long as we giue no conſent vnto them.* For the reaſon that *S. Auſtin* giueth of that aſſertion, is [l] *becauſe the guilt thereof is already taken away in Baptiſme: becauſe the ſame are already forgiuen and pardoned in Baptiſme*, thereby inſinuating, that concupiſcence and the motions thereof in themſelues are ſuch, as for which we ſhould ſay, forgiue vs our treſpaſſes, but that therefore we doe not ſay ſo, becauſe we beleeue that they are already pardoned and forgiuen vnto vs. Now it is one thing to ſay, that wee aske not forgiueneſſe thereof, becauſe it is forgiuen already; another thing to ſay, as *M. Biſhop* and his fellowes do, that it is ſuch in it ſelfe as needeth no forgiueneſſe. Whereby it plainely appeareth, that they wholy abuſe Saint *Auſtin*, and wreſt him to farre other purpoſe and meaning then was intended by him. And yet this is a thing whereof he himſelfe alſo made ſome doubt. He propoundeth it as his owne priuate opinion. [m] *So farre as I can perceiue*, ſaith he, it is ſo. *It ſeemeth to mee ſo.* [n] *Niſi fallor: if I be not deceiued*, it is ſo, and dareth not, as he ſaith, [o] *reprehend them*, who did affirme that *iuſt men might in this life* be ſo far *without ſinne*, as to be free *from conſent to any deſires of ſinne*, who, becauſe they ſhould haue nothing elſe for which to ſay forgiue vs our treſpaſſes, muſt needs ſay ſo for the very firſt motions and luſts thereof. And ſurely we dare not altogether aſſent to *Auſtin* in this behalfe, becauſe we cannot conceiue, but that the acts and motions of concupiſcence being new from day to day, muſt be accounted new treſpaſſes from day to day, and therfore from day to day giue vs occaſion to ſay, *forgiue vs our treſpaſſes.* Yet doth he aduantage the Papiſts no whit at all, becauſe by his very queſtion hereof it appeareth, that he doubted not, but that euill concupiſcences are in themſelues ſuch, as for which we ſhould ſay, forgiue vs our treſpaſſes, when propounding whether for euill concupiſcences we pray ſo vnto God, hee maketh the ground of his queſtion this, becauſe in Baptiſme they are already pardoned. And thus I hope I haue by this time made it appeare to *M. Biſhop*, that S. *Auſtin* in this point was no Papiſt, and that though in the ſignification of a word he differ from vs, yet in the very matter reſolued the ſame that we do, and that both he and the reſt of the Fathers

k *Epiſt.200. Si nullis eorum adlibceremus aſſenſum non eſſet vnde diceremus patri noſtro qui in cœlis eſt, Dimitte nobis &c.*

l *Con.2.epiſt. Pelag.lib.1.cap.13. Nec propter ipſa cuius iam reatus lauacro regenerationis abſumptus eſt dicunt in oratione Baptizati, Dimitte nobis, &c. Et cont. lit. Petil. lib.2.ca.103. Neque de his peccatis hoc petimus quæ nobis in Baptiſmo iam dimiſſa ſunt.*

m *In Pſal.118. conc.3. Quantum quidem ego ſapere poſſum.*

n *De perfect. iuſti prope finem. Quod niſi fallor nō eſſet opus dicere.*

o *Non audeo reprehendere, quamquam nec defendere valeam.*

Fathers of the Church plainely agree with vs, that *concupiſcence* in the regenerate hath the proper nature and condition of *ſinne*. But yet he will not yeeld, becauſe he hath yet ſomewhat further to alledge out of the Fathers for the proofe of that he ſaith. And firſt he alledgeth *Chryſoſtome*, ſaying, [p] *Paſſions bee not ſinnes of themſelues, but the vnbridled exceſſe of them doth make ſinner. For example, Concupiſcence is not a ſinne, but when paſſing meaſure it breaketh his bounds, then ſo it is adulterie; not in reſpect of concupiſcence, but in reſpect of the exceſſe and vnlawfull riot of it.* But heere he playeth the iugler againe, and by equiuocation meerly abuſeth his reader. For *Chryſoſtome* ſpeaketh of paſſions as they are naturall, and by God implanted in man in his creation, and common to all men; and not of paſſions as they are the remainder of Originall ſinne in the regenerate. There were paſſions in Chriſt, *anger ſorrow feare*, and ſuch like, yet in Chriſt there was no *ſinne*. And thus doth *Chryſoſtome* ſpeake of *concupiſcence* (which for diſtinction ſake ſhould rather be tranſlated *deſire*) as it is a naturall affection, not as it is a humane corruption: as it is Gods creature, not as it is mans default: as it is [q] *vnus aliquis affectuum, ſome one of the affections*, not in that ſort as we queſtion it, as it is the common diſorder of them all. The diſtinction of *concupiſcence*, which *Tertullian* vſeth, ſeemeth fitly in this place, that there is [r] *concupiſcence reaſonable and vnreaſonable*. *Reaſonable* he calleth that which is *naturall, which from the beginning was wrought in the ſoule by God the reaſonable author and maker thereof. Vnreaſonable* he ſaith, is that *which befell by the inſtinct of the Serpent, and thenceforth grew into the ſoule, and became in a ſort naturall not of that nature which is of God, but of that which the diuell hath brought in. Concupiſcence* as it importeth the naturall act of *deſiring*, he rightly affirmeth to haue bene in Chriſt, and that in vs of it ſelfe it is no ſinne. And thus is *Chryſoſtome* to be vnderſtood when he ſaith, that *affections are not ſinne of themſelues*, but *that it is the vnbridled diſorder thereof that cauſeth ſinne*. Thus as hee ſaith, *concupiſcence* referred to the naturall deſire of the male to the female, is of it ſelfe no ſinne, becauſe it is the worke of the God of nature. But our queſtion heere is of that *concupiſcence* or the remainder of that *concupiſcence* which grew by the inſtinct of the ſerpent, whereby all our deſires are by another nature growne diſordered and euill, which diſorder wee ſay in part continueth ſtil in the

p *Chryſ. ad Ro. hom. 13. Illis affectus peccatum haudquaquam erant, ſed illorum immoderatio effrenata hoc efficiebat. Verbi gratia vt vnius aliquem affectuũ illorum per raſtemus; Cõcupiſcentia peccatũ quidem non eſt at cum ea modum non ſeruat, &c. tũ res ea in adulterium erumpit, non ab ipſa iuidem concupiſcẽtia ſed ab illius immodica cupiditate.*

q *Ibid.*

r *Tertullian in de Anima. cap. 6. Rationale quod animæ a primordio eſt ingenitum, à rationali videlicet authore. Irrationale poſterius intelligendum eſt, vt quod acciderit ex ſerpentis inſtinctu atque exinde inoleuerit in anima ad inſtar iam naturalitatis &c. non ex ea natura quæ à Deo eſt, ſed ex illa quã diabolus induxit. &c. Non ſemper ex irrationali cẽſenda ſunt indigna iuũ & concupiſcentiuum, &c.*

regenerate, and is not by *M. Biſhop* as yet freed from being *ſinne*. The p'ace of S. *Bernard* anſwereth it ſelfe: ‘*Sinne is at the doore, but vnleſſe thou open it ſhall not enter in.* If *ſinne* bee at the doore, why doth *M Biſhop* denie it to be *ſinne*? What he ſaith firſt *ſinne is at the doore*, he repeateth againe in theſe words, *luſt tickleth at the heart.* If *luſt tickling at the heart* bee *ſinne at the doore*, how doth hee conclude by this place, that *luſt is no ſinne*? He ſaith, that *M. Perkins* often citeth *S. Bernard* againſt them, and therefore he may bee ſomtimes alledged for them: but if he doe alledge him no better then here he hath done, his labour ſhall bee better ſaued then ſo idlely beſtowed. But he doth not onely cite him impertinently, but alſo very lewdly. For in that very ſermon is it wherein *Bernard* ſo deſcribeth *concupiſcence*, as before was ſaid, calling *it a defilement, a contagion, a blot, a peſtilent poyſon, &c.* and ſaying thereof, *What can there be found in man cleane from this blot, free from this contagion?* thereby plainly conuincing that it is *ſin*, becauſe, as hath bin before ſaid, nothing defileth, blotteth, infecteth the ſoule but onely *ſinne*. *S Auſtin* & *S. Cyril*, he ſaith haue bin cited already, & I hope he hath had a full anſwere to thoſe citations. As for *Hierome* and *Gregorie*, when we heare what it is that he will oppoſe our of them, he ſhall haue our further anſwer; but neither they nor *Caluins* confeſſion do proue at all that *approoued antiquity is wholy for them*, as hee fondly preſumeth without cauſe. But now forſooth to hit the naile on the head, *If any*, ſaith he, *deſire to know the founder of our aduerſaries doctrine in this point, let him reade the 64. hereſie recorded by that ancient and holy Biſhop Epiphanius.* And what ſhall he reade there? Forſooth, *he regiſtreth one Proclus an old rotten ſectarie, to haue taught, that ſinnes are not taken away in Baptiſme, but are onely couered; which is as much to ſay, as ſinne remaineth ſtill in the perſon regenerate, but is not imputed to him; which*, ſaith he, *is iuſt* M. Perkins *and our Proteſtants poſition.* Now, he that had ſtood by him when he read this matter in *Epiphanius*, might very well haue ſaid to him, *Animus eſt in patinis: your mind is on your muſtard-pot*: ye reade ye know not what. For that which he alledgeth of *Proclus* was not deliuered by *Proclus*, but by *Epiphanius* is recorded out of a ſpeech of *Methodius* a Catholike and godly Biſhop againſt *Proclus*. Yet this hee thought a fit matter wherwith to delude his liege and ſoueraigne Lord, hauing before mentioned it in his Epiſtle dedicatorie to the kings

‡ *Bernard. ſer. de ſex tribulat. Peccatum in foribus eſt; niſi ipſe aperias, non intrabit: appetitus in corde prurit, ſed ſub te eſt; niſi ſponte ceſſerit, non nocebit.*

kings moſt excellent Maieſtie, in the anſwer whereof I haue ſet downe the words of *Methodius* at large, and the heretical fancie of *Proclus* againſt which they were directed. Now becauſe the words to which he alludeth, are the words of *Methodius*, and approued by *Epiphanius*, let it be remembred, that *Methodius* and *Epiphanius* two *ancient and holy Biſhops haue taught, that ſinne is not taken away in Baptiſme, but is onely couered, that is, that ſinne remaineth ſtill in the perſon regenerate, but is not imputed vnto him*, and ſo as *M. Biſhop* himſelfe confeſſeth, haue taught *iuſt the ſame that M. Perkins and the Proteſtants do now teach.*

## 10. W. BISHOP.

*Now let vs come vnto the arguments, which the Church of Rome (as* M. Perkins *ſpeakes) alledgeth to proue Concupiſcence in the regenerate, not to be ſinne properly.*

1. *Obiect.* In Baptiſme men receiue perfect and abſolute remiſſion of ſinne: Which being pardoned, is taken quite away, and therefore after Baptiſme, ceaſeth to be ſinne: M. Perkins *anſwereth, that it is aboliſhed in regard of imputation, that is, is not imputed to the perſon, but remaines in him ſtill. This anſwere is ſufficiently (I hope) confuted in the Annotations vpon our conſent in confirmation of our Argument, I will adde ſome texts of holy Scripture: Firſt,* He that is waſhed, needeth not but to waſh his feete, for he is wholy cleane. *Take with this, the expoſition of Saint* Gregorie *the great, our Apoſtle,* He cannot (*ſaith he*) be called wholy cleane in whom any part or parcell of ſinnes remaineth: *But let no man reſiſt the voyce of truth, who ſaith hee that is waſhed (in Baptiſme) is wholy cleane: therefore there is not one dramme of the contagion of ſinne left in him whome the cleanſer himſelfe, doth profeſſe to be wholy cleane. The very ſame doth the moſt learned Doctor* S. Ierome *affirme: ſaying:* How are we iuſtified and ſanctified, if any ſin be left, remaining in vs? *Againe, if holy* Dauid ſay, Thou ſhalt waſh me, and I ſhall be whiter then ſnow: *how can the blackneſſe of hell ſtill remaine in his ſoule? briefly it cannot bee but a notorious wrong vnto the precious bloud of our Sauiour, to hold, that it is not as well able to purge and purifie vs from ſinne, as* Adams *tranſgreſſion was of force to infect vs. Yea the Apoſtle teacheth vs directly, that wee recouer more*

Iohn 13.

*Lib. 9. Ep. 30.*

*Epiſt. ad Oceanū.*

Pſal. 50.

by

*by Chriſts grace, then we loſt through* Adams *fault, in theſe words:* But not as the offence, ſo alſo the gift, for if by the offence of one, many died; ſo much more the grace of God, and the gift in the grace of one man Ieſus Chriſt hath abounded vpon many. *If then wee through Chriſt, receiue more abundance of grace then wee loſt by* Adam, *there is no more ſinne left in the newly baptized man then was in* Adam *in the ſtate of innocency, albeit other defects, and infirmities doe remaine in vs, for our greater humiliation and probation, yet all filth of ſinne is cleane ſcoured out of our ſoules, by the pure grace of God powred abundantly into it in Baptiſme: and ſo our firſt Argument ſtands inſoluble.*

Rom. 5.

*Now to the ſecond.*

## R. Abbot.

This argument as it was long ago vrged by the Pelagians, ſo in them long ago hath receiued a full anſwer. It was rightly ſayd by S. *Auſtin* to them: [a] *Whoſoeuer doth derogate or detract from Baptiſme that which now we receiue by it, corrupteth Chriſtian faith: but he that euen now attributeth to it that, which by it indeede but yet hereafter we are to receiue, cutteth off Chriſtian hope.* Wee confeſſe that Baptiſme doth ſeale vnto vs the full remiſſion and forgiueneſſe of all our ſinnes: that thereby we are ingraffed into Chriſt, to become members of his body, and to be made partakers of his ſpirit, that by the ſanctification of the ſame ſpirit ſinne may be deſtroyed and decayed in vs from day to day, that the corruption of the old man being wholly put off in death, perfect righteouſneſſe may thenceforth take place for euer at the reſurrection of the dead. But this doth not ſatiſfie *M. Biſhop*: he will haue it, that *Originall ſinne* is not onely forgiuen in Baptiſme, but alſo *quite taken away*; and therfore reiecteth *M. Perkins* anſwer, that it is aboliſhed *as touching imputation*, but that otherwiſe it remaineth ſtill. Yet the anſwer fully accordeth with S. *Auſtin*, that [b] *not it ſelfe, but the guilt of it is taken away in Baptiſme*: that [c] *it remaineth as touching the actuall being, but is taken away as touching the guilt.* Now his confutation hereof muſt needs bee a very poore one, that thus directly croſſeth *S. Auſtins* aſſertion, and hath no further warrant but his owne bare word. We haue examined that before, but here in *confirmation of his*

[a] *Auguſt. cont. 2. epiſt. Pelag. li. 3. ca. 3. Quiſquis baptiſmati derogat quod modò in illud accipimus, corrupit fidē: quiſquis autem iam nunc & tribuit quod quidem per ipſū ſed tamē poſtea accepturi ſumus amputat ſpem.*

[b] *Cont. Iulian. lib. 2. Malū quod nonipſum ſed reatus eius auferetur in baptiſmo.*

[c] *Ibid. lib. 6. ca. 8. Manet actu, præterijt reatu.*

*his argument he will adde ſome texts of holy Scripture.* And firſt he alledgeth the words of Chriſt, [d] *He that is waſhed, needeth not but to waſh his feet, but is wholy cleane.* Where wee may wonder, that the mans wits ſhould ſo much faile him, thus to cite a place directly againſt himſelfe. For *Peter*, to whome Chriſt there ſpeaketh, had bene baptized before, and yet hee needed to be waſhed ſtill, inſomuch that our Sauiour ſaith to him, [e] *If I waſh thee not, thou ſhalt haue no part in mee.* Therefore the vncleanneſſe of *ſinne* was not wholy taken away in Baptiſme, but remained in part ſtill to be taken away. Nay, in the very place it ſelfe the exception is plaine. For it namely ſpecifieth, that he that is waſhed *hath ſtill neede to waſhe his feete*; and that he is not in ſuch ſort *wholy cleane*, but that his *feete* are ſtill vncleane. And what are theſe *feete*, but the corrupt affections and luſts of *ſinne*, whereby wee ſtill cleaue to the earth, and haue a remainder of fleſhly and earthly conuerſation? Of theſe the Apoſtle ſaith, [f] *Mortifie your members which are vpon the earth, fornication, vncleanneſſe, wantonneſſe, euill deſire, couetouſneſſe.* [g] *Thus did the Apoſtle ſpeake to baptized men*, ſaith *Auſtin. How then doth the baptized man mortifie fornication, which now hee committeth not, but by fighting againſt the deſires thereof, and not conſenting to them, which are not yet wanting, though daily they be diminiſhed.* Now if by reaſon of theſe earthly feete, theſe corrupt deſires being a part of originall infection, wee haue ſtill neede to be waſhed, it followeth, that by reaſon of theſe deſires wee are ſtill vncleane, euen by the hauing of them, though wee giue no conſent vnto them. Now *Ambroſe* expreſſely expoundeth this place of a remainder of *Originall ſinne*, from which ſtill after Baptiſme wee remaine to be cleanſed. [h] *Peter was cleane*, ſaith he, *but yet he was ſtill to haue his feete waſhed. For he had ſtill the ſinne that commeth by ſucceſſion from the firſt man, whom the ſerpent beguiled and perſwaded him to error. Therefore his feete are waſhed, that theſe hereditarie ſinnes may be taken away: For our owne ſinnes done by our ſelues are releaſed in Baptiſme.* Where ſpeaking of men baptized in elder yeares, as *Peter* was, he plainelie ſignifieth, that what ſinnes they haue by their owne action, they are in Baptiſme wholy aboliſhed, but that Originall ſinne, as touching the matter and corruption of it, is ſtill dwelling in vs, and that we haue ſtill neede to bee waſhed and cleanſed therefrom. And this *S. Auſtin* giueth to vnderſtand,

d Ioh. 13. 10.

e Ver. 8.

f Col. 3. 5.

g *Aug. cont. Iulian. lib. 6. cap 5. Iam baptizatis dicebat Apoſtolus, Mortificate, &c. Quomodo ergo mortificat baptizatus fornicationem quam non iam perpetrat niſi cùm deſideria eius quibus non conſentit expugnat, quæ in bene facientibus et omnino non fornicantibus nec conſentientibus nec operi eis non deſunt tamen quotidiè minuuntur?*

h *Ambroſ. de iis qui initiantur myſt. ca. 6. Mundus erat Petrus, ſed plantam lauare debebat. Habebat enim prima homynis de ſucceſſione peccatum quando eum ſupplantauit ſerpens & perſuaſit errorem.*

who-

who writing vpon thoſe ſpeeches of Chriſt, alketh the queſtion, i *Whether there in this life ſo cleane, as that he is not more and more to be cleanſed or made cleane?* and ſo affirmeth that the faithfull are here, *mundi & mundandi: cleane*, but yet ſo as that in part they remaine ſtill *to be cleanſed*, accordingly as the Apoſtle exhorteth the faithfull, k *Let vs cleanſe our ſelues from all filthineſſe of the fleſh and of the ſpirit, and grow vp to full holineſſe in the feare of God.* But heere *M. Biſhop* alledgeth *Gregorie*, affirming by thoſe words of Chriſt, that *he that is waſhed hath not any thing remaining of his ſinne, &c.* Which words *Gregorie* indeed hath, but altogether to other purpoſe then *M. Biſhop* citeth them, diſputing in that place againſt ſome who held l *peccata in Baptiſmo ſuperficie tenus dimitti, that ſinnes in Baptiſme are but ſuperficially pardoned.* Againſt them hee alledgeth the words of Chriſt here ſpoken, and interreth, m *Si igitur peccata in Baptiſmo ſũditus minimè dimittuntur, &c. If then ſins be not altogether forgiuen in Baptiſme, how then is hee wholy cleane that is waſhed? For he cannot be ſaid to be wholy cleane, to whom any thing is remaining of his ſinne.* And to that meaning he ſaith, *that there is nothing remaining to him of the contagion of his ſinne*, comparing the guilt of *ſinne* to a contagion or infection, wherewith the perſon is ſtill touched after that the fact is paſt and gone, vntill by forgiuenes it be taken away. Now let theſe words be referred to the drift whereto they were written (which being expreſſed in the next words before, *M. Biſhop* hath very guilefully concealed) and they haue nothing in them contrary to our aſſertion. For we deny not, but that *ſins* are fully and wholy pardoned to the regenerate: wee deny not, but that the guilt thereof is quite taken away, and therefore by *Gregories* teſtimonie *M. Biſhop* auaileth nothing. The very like doth *Ambroſe* ſay, n *Sinne can haue no portion in a man whom forgiueneſſe of ſinnes hath ſwallowed vp*, who yet plainly affirmeth the remaining of Originall ſinne it ſelfe after the pardon thereof, as before is ſaid. Now we may not thinke that *Gregorie* was ſo ſimple, as that hee ſaw not in the words of Chriſt, that hee that is ſayd to bee *wholy cleane*, hath an exception ſet downe as touching his *feete*, and therfore could not intend any further, but that hee is *wholy cleane*, as touching *the guilt*, yet partly ſtill vncleane by remainder of corruption. To *Gregorie* he addeth *Hierome*, but the words which he alledgeth are a meere forgerie. Hee hath borrowed them from

*Bellarmine*

i *Aug. in Ioan. tract. 80. Qui eſt in hac vita ſic mundus vt non ſit magis magiſq; mundandus?*

k 2. Cor. 7. 1.

l *Gregor. lib. 9. epiſt. 39. Siqui ſunt qui dicunt peccata in Baptiſmo ſuperficie tenus dimitti, quid eſt hac prædicatione infidelius?*

m *Si igitur peccata in Baptiſmate ſunditus minimè dimittuntur quomodo is qui totus eſt, mundus eſt totus? Totus enim mundus dici non poteſt cui de peccato aliquid remanſit. Sed nemo reſiſtit voci veritatis quæ ait, Qui totus eſt, &c. Nihil ergo ei de peccati ſui contagione remanet, quẽ totum fatetur mundum ipſe qui remittit.*

n *Ambroſ. in Pſ. 118. Ser. 18. Culpa in eo habere non poteſt portionem quem abſorbuerit remiſſio peccatorum.*

*Bellarmine* of truth, and *Bellarmine* hath deceaued him, as hee will do any man that putteth any trust in him. *Hierome* in the [a] epistle cited by him, speaketh somwhat of Baptisme in behalfe of one who had had two wiues, one before he was baptized another after, and was thereupon question, whether he might be Bishop or no, because the Apostle saith, that a *Bishop should be the husband of one wife*. He disputeth at large, that if Baptisme take away sins, much more it should take away the imputation of that that is no sin, but neither hath the words which *M. Bishop* alledgeth, nor any other that can serue *M. Bishops* turne. Is further hee alledged that *Dauid* saith, [b] *Thou shalt wash me and I shall be whiter then snow: but thou* saith he, *in the blackenesse of hell remaine in his sinne?* But let me aske him, if *Originall sinne* be taken quite away in the regenerate, how then cometh it to passe, that *Dauid* hauing receiued the effect of Baptisme in the Sacrament of Circumcision, and now a long time continued in the state of grace, doth yet complaine of *Originall sinne*, and doth mention it as the fountain of those enormous sins, which in that Psalme he bewaileth and bemoneth vnto God? [c] *Behold*, saith he, *I was born in iniquitie, and in sinne hath my mother conceiued me*. Why doth he thus [d] *confesse*, as *Ambrose* saith, *the filth both of speciall, & also of common*, that is to say, *Originall sinne*, if there were now no *Originall sin* in him to be confessed? And as for that which *M. Bishop* saith, the same *Ambrose* telleth vs therof, *that he is made whiter then snow to whom the fault is pardoned*, who yet affirmeth the continuing of *Originall sinne* in him that is pardoned, as we haue seene before. He was therefore whiter then snow, as touching imputation and guilt, when the fault was pardoned, according to the saying of *Austin*, that [e] *all the commandements of God are reputed as done, when that is pardoned that is not done*. But yet whe he had heard it deliuered vnto him by the Prophet *Nathan*, that [f] *the Lord had taken away his sinne*, he prayed notwithstanding, *Create in me a cleane heart, renew in me a right spirit, wash me and I shall be whiter then snow*, acknowledging an vncleannesse in himselfe, from which he had still neede to be renewed and washed, from which when he should be washed he should be whiter then snow, but from which no man is so fully washed in this life, but that he hath need still to prayse be washed and cleansed more and more. For what is it to be made *whiter then snow*, but to be made *without spot or wrinkle*,

[a] *Ad Oceanum.*

[b] Psal. 51. 7.

[c] ver. 5.

[d] *Ambros. Apolog. Dauid. ca. 12. Peccati rerum speciatim omnium atque communium colluuiē confitetur.*

[e] *Ibid. Supra quem dealbatur cui culpa dimittitur.*

[f] *Aug. Retract. li. 1. c. 19. Omnia mandata facta deputantur quecunq; dimissa fuerint.* 2. Sam. 12. 13. Psal. 51. 7.

or any such thing? But to bee made *without spot or wrinkel*, [z] befalleth to no man in this life as S. *Austin* well obserueth. Therefore no man in this life becommeth *whiter then snow*, by being free from all inordinall blot of vncleannesse and sinne. And therefore to take away from *M. Bishop* all matter of cauill, *Basil* plainely saith, that [a] *the washing of Baptisme sufficeth not to bring a man to the whitenes of snow, but that there needeth also great labour and diligence, and that ere to make it perfect and abiding colour, there needeth often dipping & much paines, sowe it also in the soule corrupted with the filth of sinne, & being in a habite of euill, that hardly and with much adoe it can bee washed and cleansed from it.* But saith *M. Bishop*, it is a notorious wrong to the precious blood of our Sauiour Christ, to hold, that it is not as well able to purge and purifie vs from sinne, as *Adams transgression was of force to infect vs.* And what doth he say therein more then we also say? We acknowledge as much, and not onely so, but we saie further as hee saith, that *we recouer more by Christs grace, then we haue lost by Adams fault*, according to the words of the Apostle which he citeth to that purpose. What inferreth he now hereof? *If then*, saith he, *we through Christ receiue more abundance of grace then we lost by Adam, there is no more sin left in the newly baptized man, then was in Adam in the state of innocency.* But this conclusion followeth not. For although wee recouer more in Christ then we lost in *Adam*, yet wee do not presently receiue the same. God hath [b] *blessed us in Christ with all manner spirituall blessings in heauenly things*, but wee haue not as yet the fruition thereof. Christ hath recouered for vs immortality and incorruption, yet mortality and corruption hitherto continue still. The grace of Christ doth not onely yeeld vs the state which *Adam* had *Posse non peccare, to haue power not to sinne*, but also a higher perfection [c] *non posse peccare, to bee without possibility of sinne*, and yet who seeth not, that we haue not attained to this perfection? God hath [d] *raised vs vp together with Christ, and made vs sit together in heauenly places*. [e] *Nondum in re sed in spe, not yet indeede but in hope*, saith S. *Austin*. Thus haue wee receiued more in Christ, then wee haue lost in *Adam*, not yet actually and indeed, but in assurance of hope. [f] *Our state heere*, saith *Tertullian*, *is a contemplation of hope through faith, an vnderstanding of things to come: it is not possession but expectation.* And this the Apostle confirmeth, saying, that [g] *wee walke by faith and not by sight*: that *wee are saued in hope, but hope which is seene*

z. *August. de nupt. & concupis. lib. 1. cap. 34. Vt exhibeat eam sibi non in isto seculo sed in futuro, non habentem maculam. &c.*

a *Basil. in Esa. cap. 1. Nec vsque adeo sufficiens per se est regenerationis lauacrum vt totum promoueat ad laborem nisi aut lanae, sed & opera requirantur: nec perfunctoria aut qualicunque diligentia est opus ad hoc vt lauacrum quidem sit effectiuum puritatis & expurgationis a sordibus, &c. Et quemadmodum in tinctu is quod repetitis vicibus ac multo cum labore intinctum est, tinctura accipit pressius inhaerescentem, &c. Ad eundem fere modum anima sanie peccatorum suppurata, & in habitudine constituta malitiae. Ista enim mali affectus tudo vix ac multa negotio potest eliui, &c.*

b Eph. 1. 3.

c *Aug. de correp. & grat. cap. 11.*

d Eph. 2. 6.

e *Aug. de bapt. lib. 1. cap. 4.*

f *Tertul. de resurrect. carnis. Contemplatio est spei in hoc spatio per fidem, non praesentatio, nec possessio sed expectatio.*

g Rom. 8. 24.

ſcene is no hope; that [h] *wee waite for the adoption, euen the redemption of our bodies,* [i] *the redemption of poſſeſſion,* as it is rightly called, *to the praiſe of his glory.* How is it that hauing alreadie receiued adoption, wee yet looke for the *adoption*; that be already redeemed, we yet looke for a redemption; that being regenerate in Chriſt, we yet expect a regeneration, but becauſe the fruit & effect & ſubſtance of our adoption, redemption, regeneration, the adoption, redemption, regeneration of *poſſeſſion* remaineth yet vnperformed vnto vs? We receiue now [k] *a firſt fruits*, and ſome ſmall beginnings, as for a taſt, ſo for a pledge & aſſurance of the reſt, but [l] *in compariſon of that that ſhall be at the reſurrection, the life that now is, is but euen dung*, as *S. Auſtin* ſaith. Therefore *M. Biſhop* ſtretcheth the preſent effect of Baptiſme too farre, when hee ſaith, that *in the man newly baptized, there is no more ſinne left then was in Adam in the ſtate of innocency.* This is no Catholique doctrine; it is meere hereſie, it is but the dreame of the Pelagians. So they ſaid, that [m] *men in Baptiſme are perfectly renewed*, and [n] *that they cannot be called the ſonnes of God vnleſſe they be made altogether without ſinne.* And this by *M. Biſhops* doctrine, is not onely gained by the Sacrament of Baptiſme, but alſo renewed euery while by their Sacrament of penance. *M. Biſhops* abſolution, if we beleeue him, will ſet a man for the preſent as *free from ſinne as Adam was in the ſtate of innocency.* Fie vpon theſe lewd paradoxes: why do they delude ſimple ſoules with theſe hereticall poſitions, which they themſelues in their own conſciences muſt neceſſarily condemne? We haue heard before, how *Baſil* condemneth this aſſertion of perfect puritie attained in Baptiſme. In the like ſort doth *Hilary* teach, that [o] *wee may not thinke that there is reſtored in the Sacrament of Baptiſme, that perfect innocencie and puritie that is worthy of heauenly life, but that there is remaining after the water of Baptiſme the cleanſing of perfect puritie, which by the griefuance of death ſhall purge vs from the blot and ſociety of that carion wherewith wee are now blended.* Thus *Epiphanius* alledgeth out of *Methodius* againſt *Proclus* that [p] *ſinne by enlightning grace is not taken quite away, for then men ſhould not ſinne after Baptiſme; it is therefore holden in and quieted (in the Baptized) by faith but is not yet pulled vp by the rootes.* But moſt notably of all other doth *S. Auſtin* determine this point againſt the plagian here-

h Verſ. 23.
i Eph. 1. 14. εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως.
k Rom. 8. 23.
l Aug. de Temp. ſer. 49. In comparatione reſurrectionis ſtercus eſt tota vita quam gerimus.
m Conſt. duas epiſt. Pelag. lib. 4. cap. 7. Dicunt Baptiſmo perfectè homines renouari.
n Epiſt. 106. Filios Dei non poſſe vocari niſi omnino abſque peccato ſint effecti.
o Hilar. in Pſa. 118 Gimel: Si quis exiſtimet ſibi in Sacramento Baptiſmi perfectam illam innocentiam & cæleſtis vitæ dignam redditam puritatem, lauacrum Baptiſmatis dixiſſe recolat, Ergo quidem & eſt ergo quantum lateat exiſtimare perfectæ illius emundationis puritatis etiam poſt Baptiſmi aquas repoſita quæ nos per mortis iniuriam à labe mortalitatis & ſocietate purgabit, &c.
p Epiph. hær. 64. Alioqui poſt illuminationem non conſequeretur, non iuſta facere, vt poſt peccato penitus ſyncerè & nolis ablato, &c. Quare conſtat contrahi quidem ac ſepiri per fidem nunc peccatum, vt ne fructus vberior prodicat; non autem radicitus tolli;

tikes, affirming still that in Baptisme there is nothing perfectly yeelded vnto vs but onely the forgiuenesse of sinnes. [s] *Our renewing*, saith hee, *beginneth at the remission of sinnes, and so farre as a man mindeth the things of the spirit, so far he is renewed, but the rest is done in hope for the time till it may be done indeed. And albeit there be in Baptisme a totall and full forgiuenesse of sins, yet if in the mind it selfe which is the inner man, there were in Baptisme a perfect newnesse, the Apostle would not say, Though our outward man be corrupted, yet our inward man is renewed from day to day. For he that is renewed from day to day, is not yet wholy renewed, and so farre as hee is not yet renewed, so farre is he yet in his olde estate. Therfore the Apostle exhorteth the faithfull baptized to put off the old man, &c. which they should not bee warned to doe, if in Baptisme it were perfectly done already.* Againe he saith, that [t] *a man by spirituall regeneration is wholy in hope, but indeed is yet but in part renewed*, and proposeth it for a thing, [u] *specially to be regarded and remembred that onely forgiuenesse of sinnes is full and perfect in Baptisme, and that the quality of man is not forthwith wholy changed, but that the spirituall first fruits in them that go well forward by newnesse encreasing from day to day, doe turne or change to the same that which is old according to the flesh, vntill there bee renewing of the whole.* Now how doth this stand with that which *M. Bishop* affirmeth, that not onely the guilt of sinne is taken away by forgiuenesse, but also the whole blot and deformity thereof is quite abolished in Baptisme, and full and perfect righteousnesse atchieued therein? If onely forgiuenesse of sinnes bee full and perfect in Baptisme, then there cannot bee sayd to bee a full and perfect abolishing of sinne it selfe. It is false therefore which hee saith, that *in the man newly baptized there is left no sinne, no more sinne then was in Adam in the state of innocencie.* To which purpose hee addeth further, that *albeit other defects and infirmities doe remaine in vs, for our greater humiliation and probation, yet all filth of sinne is cleane scoured out of our soules, by the pure grace of God powred abundantly into it in Baptisme.* Which now how farre it is from truth, it appeareth by that that hath beene already sayd. I will

q *August. de pecat. mer. & rem. lib. 1. cap. 7. Renatio datur in remissione omnium peccatorum. Et in quam tenui quisque spirituali sapiat qui iam sapit, in tantum renouatur, cætera verò in spe facta sunt donec etiam in re fiant, &c. In Baptismo quamuis tota & plena sit remissio peccatorum, tamen si in ipso animo qui est homo interior perfecta in Baptismo nouitas fieret non diceret Apostolus, Etsi exterior, &c. Profectò enim qui de die in diem renouatur nondum totus est renouatus, & in quantum nondum est renouatus in tantum adhuc in vetustate est, &c. Et hoc vt faciat iam baptizatos fidelesq; admonetur, quod ad hunc modum non esset si hoc in Baptismo iam perfectè factum esset.*

r *Ibid. cap. 10. Homo totus in spe iam & iam in re ex parte in regeneratione spirituali renouatus.*

s *Ibid. cap. 27. Illud præcipuè attendere ac meminisse debemus tantum modo peccatorum omnium plenam perfectamque remissionem Baptismo fieri: hominis verò ipsius qualitatem non totam continuò mutari, sed spirituales primitias in bono proficere: bonis de die in diem nouitate crescente consumatur in eo quod carnaliter vetus est donec totum renouetur.*

will here adde only the words of *Hilary*, who ſaith, [t] *We haue as new a matter mingled with vs, which is ſubiect to the law of ſinne and death, and that in the houſe of this mortall and weake fleſh, we gather a blot of corruption by the ſociety thereof, and vntill the body bee glorified into the nature of the ſpirit, there cannot bee in vs the nature of true life; that this world is not the land of the liuing, but that wee are heere ſtill to bee cleanſed by reaſon of being blended with the carion (of concupiſcence) and that this was the thing figured in the law, where a man was vncleane for touching any dead body.* Surely if in this life wee remaine ſtill in caſe to be cleanſed, if there be ſtill a blot of corruption by reaſon of concupiſcence ſtill cleauing faſt vnto vs, and it can be no otherwiſe till the body bee glorified into the nature of the ſpirit, then it is veterly falſe, as indeed it is, to ſay that in *Baptiſme all filth of ſinne is cleane waſhed away out of our ſoules*. But whereas all men find by experience both in themſelues and others, that there is a wonderfull prauity and corruption of nature ſtill continuing, whereby wee are all forward to that that is euill, and altogether backward and vntoward to goodneſſe, to preuent the obiection hereof, *M. Biſhop* acknowledgeth a remainder of ſomewhat, but hee qualifieth the opinion thereof with fauourable and gentle termes. He ſaith, that *defects and infirmities* remaine in vs, matry, in no caſe muſt wee thinke them to bee ſinnes. But theſe *defects and infirmities* are ſuch, as for which it is true of vs which Saint *Auſtin* ſaith, [u] *Reſumus adhuc filij iræ, ſpe non ſumus. By reaſon of ſtate and being we are ſtill the children of wrath; it is in hope as touching which we are not ſo.* How are we yet the children of wrath, but by hauing in vs the matter of [x] *that wrath wherewith wee were all borne*, which what is it but onely ſinne? Theſe *defects* then and *infirmities*, what are they properly and in truth but onely *ſinne*? But *M. Biſhop* in vſing theſe termes alludeth to *S. Auſtin*, who oftentimes ſo calleth concupiſcence and the luſts and motions thereof; which if he did in the ſame meaning as *S. Auſtin* doth, there ſhould bee no matter of great queſtiō betwixt him & vs. For *S. Auſtin* calleth *concupiſcence vitium, a defect*, not as vnderſtanding thereby as the Engliſh word importeth, a meer priuation and want of ſomewhat that ſhould be, but a poſitiue euil quality that ought not to be, a vicious & corrupt condition of man, ſuch a defect, if we will ſo call it (let vs call it [y] *a corruption*, as he himſelf expoundeth it) as [z] *by reaſon whereof* the ſame S.

t *Hilar. in Pſal. 118. Gimel. Habemus etiam nunc admixtam nobis materiam quæ mortui legi atque peccati obnoxia eſt, & in huius caduca carnis infirmæ; domicilio corruptionis labē ex eius conſortio mutuamur, ac niſi glorificato in naturam ſpiritus corpore vitæ vere in nobis non poteſt eſſe natura, &c. Scit hanc mundi iſtius ſedem regionem non eſſe viuentium: ſcit nos adhuc ſecundum præfigurationem legis emundandos eſſe. Nunc enim admiſcemur martirio & in lege qui ſquis mortuũ contractat, immundus eſt, &c.*

u *Auguſt. in Pſal. 57.*

x *In Pſal. 101. Ira cum qua omnes nati ſumus ira de propagine iniquitatis, de maſſa peccati.*

y *De lib. arbit. lib. 3. cap. 19. Vitij nomen maximè ſolet eſſe corruptio.*

z *Epiſt. 29. Sicut pra. Sect. 8.*

*Auſtin* ſaith, that *no man liuing ſhall be found righteous in the ſight of God*, as we haue ſeene before. It is *vitium*, ſuch a *defect*, as whereby [a] *the nature of man is vitiated and corrupted, and ſo farre as it is corrupted is euill*, and there is nothing that maketh an euill man, but onely ſinne. It is [b] *defectus à iuſtitia, a defection or ſwarning from righteouſneſſe*, hindring, that [c] *wee loue not God with all our ſoule*, [d] *diminiſhing that ſpirituall delight that we ought to haue in the law of God*, and [e] *it is ſinne when there is not that loue in vs that ought to bee, or the ſame is leſſe then it ought to be.* But it is not onely after Baptiſme that *S. Auſtin* giueth to concupiſcence this name of *vitium, a defect*, or rather *a vice or vitious qualitie*: hee calleth it from the beginning [f] *vitium quo vitiata eſt natura humana: a vice or vicious qualitie wherewith the nature of man is vitiated and defiled.* Now before Baptiſme there is no doubt but S *Auſtine* by *vice* importeth *ſinne*, becauſe for it he ſaith, [g] *the nature of man is condemned, and is vnder the power of the diuell*, and the thing being ſtill the ſame, how ſhould it after *B*aptiſme bee no ſinne? A beit after *B*aptiſme he calleth it [h] *vitium mortuum, a vice or vitious quality that is now dead, becauſe*, ſaith he, *it is dead as touching the guilt wherewith it held vs*, but otherwiſe it liueth ſtill. Hee calleth the luſts thereof [i] *vitia à quorum reati abſoluti ſumus: vices from the guilt whereof we are releaſed*, importing ſtill, that ſaue the guilt they are ſtill the ſame that they were before. Therefore albeit hee forbeare the name of *ſinne* after Baptiſme, in reſpect that they haue not the effect of ſinne to make guilty before God, becauſe they are already pardoned, yet he cannot bee ſuppoſed otherwiſe to exclude them from the nature and name of *ſinne*. They did make guilty before, and ſhould make guilty ſtill, but that they are pardoned, which cannot agree but to *ſinne* onely. And this did *Pighius* a friend of *M. Biſhops* ſee very well, [k] that it is impoſſible, that the nature of *ſinne*, and the nature of *concupiſcence* abiding ſtil the ſame, that *concupiſcence* before Baptiſme ſhould be ſinne, and after *B*aptiſme ſhould bee no *ſinne*. Now as both before *B*aptiſme and after *B*aptiſme it is called by *S. Auſten a defect*, ſo is it alſo called, *infirmitas, an infirmitie, languor, a faintneſſe or weakeneſſe*, not growing of a bare priuation, as I ſaid before, but of a vicious conſtitution, a corrupt and euill habite, which therefore he compareth to a [l] corrupt and noyſome diſtemper of the body, wherby diſeaſes are propagated

a *De ciuit. Dei. li. 12. cap. 3.*
b *Con. Iul. li. 2.*
c *De perfect. iuſt. Rat. 17 ſup. ſec. 4.*
d *Cõt. Iul. l. 4. c. 2. In quantum ineſt noceat etſi non ad perdenda de ſorte ſanctorum, tamen ad minuendam ſpiritualem delectationẽ ſanctarũ mentium, illã de qua dicit Apoſtolus, Condelector legi, &c.*
e *De perfect. iuſt. Rat. 15 Supra Sect. 2.*
f *De nupt. & concup. l. 1. c. 23.*
g *Ibid. Propter quod damnatur, propter hoc & damnabili diabolo ſubiugatur.*
h *Cont. Iul. lib. 3. Quia mortuum eſt in eo reatus quo nos tenebat.*
i *Ibid.*

k *Pigh. de peccato Orig. cont. 1. Vt vna eademq; manens æquitatis & iuſtitiæ regula, idẽ aliquid in ſe manens nunc propriè, primo verèq; peccatum ſit, nunc non ſit fieri prorſus non poteſt.*
l *Aug. de nupt. & concupiſ. l. 2. c. 34. Sicut malain corpora valetudo &c. Et cõt. Iul. l. 6. c. 7. Quodam operante contagio, id eſt, cõcupiſcentiæ affectus; ſicut de parentibus morbidis morbida ſoboles procreatur.*

pagated in generation from the parents to the children. The Apoſtle expreſſeth the whole corruption of mans nature by the name of *infirmity* or *weakneſſe*, when he ſaith, [m] *When wee were yet infirme or weake, Chriſt died for vs.* Whereas S. *Auſtin* witneſſeth the Apoſtle, by [n] *infirme* or *weake*, meaneth the ſame as he doth when hee ſaith immediatly, *vngodly, ſinners, enemies vnto God. Infirmitie* therefore impliеth and importeth *ſinne, vngodlineſſe, enmity againſt God.* Thus doth *Auſtin* ſay, that [o] *infirmity ſeemeth a light matter, but yet ſometimes it is ſuch as that* [p] *it is called impiety.* And thus doth he call the penall diſeaſe of Originall ſinne, [q] *an infirmitie*, as before was ſayd. This is [r] *languor qua bene vivendi virtus perijt, the fainting weakneſſe whereby wee loſt the power of living well*, otherwiſe by him termed, [s] *vulnus quod vulnerant ipſam vitam qua rectè vivebatur; a wound that woundeth that life whereby man ſhould liue aright.* This *infirmitie S. Auſtin* acknowledgeth euery where to continue ſtill. [t] *It is not*, he ſaith, *wholy conſumed in Baptiſme:* [u] *of it and for it wee haue ſtill cauſe to cry, Haue mercy vpon me, for I am weake:* [x] *with it we are ſtill to wraſtle and ſtriue ſo long as we here liue*, which being the ſame that it was before, [y] *contrary to the ſpirit of God*, [z] *rebelling againſt the law of God*, though the guilt thereof bee pardoned, muſt needs in it ſelfe be *ſinne*, as it was before. And thus much of *M. Biſhops inſoluble argument*, containing nothing in it againſt vs, which the ancient Church doth not wholy diſauow.

m Rom 5.6.
n *Aug. epiſt. 59. Hos dixit infirmos quos impios quos infirmos, eos peccatores. &c.*
o *De Trinit. lib. 3 cap. 10. Leue aliquid videtur infirmitas, ſed aliquando talis eſt vt impietas nominetur.*
p *De peccat. mer. & remiſſ. lib. 2. cap. 17.*
q *De nupt. & cõcupiſc. lib. 2. ca. 34*
r *Ibid.*
ſ *De peccat. mer. & remiſſ. l. 2. cap. 7. Non ex qua hora quiſquam baptizatur omnis vetus infirmitas eius abſumitur.*
t *Cont. 2. epiſt. Pelag. lib. 3. cap. 3. Propter hoc dicens miſerere mei Domine quoniam infirmus ſum.*
u *Ibid. Hac infirmitas cum qua vſque ad corporis mortem defectu & profectu æternaꝫ contendimus.*
x Galathians 5. 17.
y Rom. 7. 23.

## II. W. BISHOP.

2. *Obiect.* Euery ſinne is voluntary, and not committed without the conſent of man: but this concupiſcence whereof we talke, hath no conſent of man; but riſeth againſt his will: therefore is no ſinne. *M. Perkins anſwereth*: That ſuch actions, as are vſed of one man towards another, muſt be voluntary, but ſinne towards God may be committed without our conſent. For euery want of conformitie vnto the law, euen in our body, although againſt our will, be ſinnes in the Court of conſcience. *Reply: Full little knowes this man what belongeth to the Court of conſcience: the ſecret faults indeed be examined, but nothing is taken for ſinne by any one learned in that*

*faculties, which is done without a mans free conſent: all of them holding with* S. Auguſtine: That ſinne is ſo voluntary an euill, that it cannot be ſinne, which is not voluntarie: *And to ſay with* M. Perkins *that any want of conformitie to reaſon in our body is ſinne, is ſo abſurd, that a man might (if that were true) bee damned for a dreame, how well ſoeuer diſpoſed he went to ſleepe: if he chance to dreame of vnclean-neſſe, whereupon doth enſue any euill motion in his fleſh. This paradoxe of ſinning without a mans conſent, is ſo contrary vnto both naturall and ſupernaturall reaſon, that* S. Auguſtine *auerreth*, Neither any of the ſmall number of the learned, nor of the multitude of the vnlearned to hold, that a man can ſinne without his conſent. *What vnlearned learned men then are ſtart vp in our miſerable age, that make no bones to denie this, and greater matters too?*

Lib. 3. de lib. arb. cap. 17.

Lib. de vera Relig. cap. 14.

## R. Abbot.

To the obiection heere propounded, *M. Perkins* hath giuen a double anſwer. To the one *M. Biſhop* replieth, making choice of that that his wit would beſt ſerue him to play vpon: but to the other, which is the ſame that *S. Auſtin* ſtil vſed againſt the ſame obiection of the Pelagian heretikes, he vſeth not a word. Let vs aske *M. Biſhop* himſelfe, What, is there not *ſinne* in infants before they be baptized? He will tell vs that there is. But then wee vrge him with their owne rule, Euery ſinne is voluntary; but that that is in infants vnbaptized is not voluntary, becauſe they haue no act of will, therefore that that is in infants vnbaptized is no *ſinne*. Will he not here ſay as *M. Perkins* doth, according to *S. Auſtines* doctrin, which indeed is true, that the ſinne that is in infants is [a] voluntary by the will of him that firſt ſinned, but not by the will of them to whom it is originall: that it is now [b] *naturall* to man, but yet the beginning of it was *by the will of man?* Which anſwer when hee hath giuen vs, let him take it backe againe to himſelfe, that the ſinne of concupiſcence is voluntarie by the will of him by whom it firſt came, not by our will: and that if he meane that to bee voluntary which is by the act of a mans owne will, his rule is true onely in actuall ſinnes, and not in ſinne Originall whereof we diſpute. But of this point *I* haue anſwered ſufficiently before in the queſtion of [c] *Free will*, and need no further here to ſtand vpon: only I wiſh the

a *Aug. Retract. lib. 1. cap. 13. Supra Sect. 2.*

b *De ciuit. Dei. li. 12 ca. 3. Quod vitium conſuetudine inimicæ progreſſu roboratum naturaliter inoleuit, à voluntate ſumpſit exordium*

c *Sect. 18.*

the Reader to obſerue, how *M. Biſhop* hath here ſoiſted in, that ſin is not *committed without mans conſent*, whereof *M. Perkins* mentioned nothing. And therefore as *Auſtine* ſaid to *Iulian*, obiecting *how ſhould ſinne be aſcribed to that perſon, which hath neither will nor power to ſinne*, ſo do I anſwere to this ſcholar of *Iulian*, that [d] *it is one thing to ſpeake of committing ſinnes of a mans own: another thing to ſpeake of the contagion that commeth by anothers ſinne.* Our ſpeech is heere of a ſinne, that without any conſent or act of ours, is deriued vnto vs by contagion from our father *Adam*, which though it bee ours without any conſent of ours, and againſt our wils doth tempt vs and entice vs, yet we confeſſe cannot be perpetrated and committed, but by the conſent and liking of the will. *M. Biſhop* if hee had meant honeſtly, ſhould haue accordingly propounded the obiection, as *M. Perkins* did, that the anſwere might be ſeene to bee direct and plaine, as indeed it is. But hee thought that was not for his turn: he knoweth that by truth and ſimplicity he cannot thriue with bad wares, and therefore muſt vſe ſhuffling and ſhifting for the vttering of them. But let vs now ſee what his reply is to *M. Perkins* anſwer to that obiection. *M. Perkins* ſaith, that *the propoſition, that euery ſin is voluntary, is a politike rule pertaining to the courts of men, and doth not hold in the court of conſcience, which God holdeth in mens hearts, in which euery want of conformity to the law, is made a ſinne.* To this *M. Biſhop* anſwereth full wiſely: *Little knows this man, what belongeth to the court of conſcience: there ſecret faults indeed be examined, but nothing is taken for ſin by any one learned in that facultie, which is done without a mans free conſent.* Where when *M. Perkins* hath ſpoken of *a court of conſcience kept by God*, he anſwereth, of *a court of conſcience* kept by men, and thoſe, as we muſt vnderſtand him, his owne fellowes, and ſo to the purpoſe anſwereth nothing. In Gods *court of conſcience*, [e] *euill thoughts defile a man*: what they do in their courts of conſcience, it ſkilleth not. In Gods court of conſcience, [f] *to luſt is to ſin, becauſe the law hath ſaid, Thou ſhalt not luſt*; it is a ſigne that they haue no conſcience, that keepe a court of conſcience to iudge againſt that that God hath iudged, that to luſt is no ſinne. In Gods *court of conſcience*, [g] *all vnrighteouſneſſe is ſinne*, and therefore all *tranſgreſſion of the law*, becauſe it is vnrighteouſneſſe, *is ſinne*: if their court of conſcience determine otherwiſe, it muſt abide the cenſure of his court, and receiue check and charm from thence.

d *Cont. Iulian. li 6. ca. 4. Aliud eſt perpetratio proprierum, aliud alienorum contagio delictorum.*

e Mat. 15. 19.

f Rom. 7. 7.

g 1. Iohn 5. 17.

In

In Gods *court of conſcience* is required[h] *all the heart, and all the mind, and all the ſoule, and all the ſtrength*, and the true informed conſcience for not giuing all, reſteth conuicted of *ſinne*: what court of conſcience doe they keepe, that giue but a part in ſteed of all, and yet haue a conſcience to ſay, that they ſinne not therein? What *court of conſcience* do they keep, that frame Gods commandements to their conſcience, and not their conſcience to Gods commandements? whoſe conſcience is like the bed of *Procruſtes* the giant; whatſoeuer God ſaith, that is too ſhort for it, they haue a racke to ſtretch it longer: whatſoeuer God ſaith, that is too long for it, they haue an axe to cut it ſhorter. *M. Biſhop* did amiſſe, in ſteed of a court of conſcience kept by God, to tell vs of a court of conſcience kept by them. But if we will ſpeake of a *court of conſcience* for reſoluing *caſes of conſcience*, we may well eſteeme by that that we ſee, that *M. Perkins* did much better know what belongeth to the *court of conſcience* then *M. Biſhop* doth. As for thoſe *learned in that faculty*, of whom he ſpeaketh, all whelps of the ſame foxe, what they thinke it is nothing to vs, but more learned then they are do know, as hath bene ſhewed, that *ſinne* may be without conſent of the will, nay againſt the will of him in whom it is *ſinne*. For euill motions and thoughts ariſe in the regenerate man againſt his will, and it hath bene ſufficiently proued, that ſuch euill motions and thoughts are ſinne: and who is there that hath a feeling conſcience, that doth not condemne himſelfe in the ariſing thereof, and aske God forgiuenеſſe, that his mind hath bene ouertaken and caried away into ſuch thoughts, howſoeuer he haue preuented the conſent and liking of them? But ſaith *M. Biſhop, to ſay with M. Perkins that any want of conformity to reaſon in our body, is ſin, is ſo abſurd, that a man might if that were true, be damned for a dreame, how well ſoeuer hee went to ſleepe. if he chance to dreame of vncleanneſſe, whereupon doth enſue any euil motion in his fleſh.* Where he hath turned *conformitie to Gods law, into conformity to reaſon:* and maketh *M. Perkins* to talke of *conformity in the body*, who mentioneth nothing of the *body*, onely that he may make way thereby to a dreaming anſwere of an vncleane dreame. Which dreames notwithſtanding are a very ſtrong argument, of a pollution and vncleanneſſe of nature yet habitually remaining, and a very proper effect thereof, which it is Gods mercy not to impute vnto vs, for[i] *if the moſt high ſhould impute the ſame,*

[h] Deut. 6. 3.

[i] *Auguſt. cont. Julian. lib. 4. ca. 3. Cum ſopitos deludunt omnia ſenſus n: ſcio quomodo etiam caſte animæ in turpes labuntur aſſenſus: quæ ſi imputaret Altiſſimus, quis viueret caſtus?*

ſaith

ſaith S. Auſtine, *who ſhould liue chaſt? M. Biſhop* maketh nothing hereof, but *S. Auſtine* ſaith, that ſuch dreams are breach of chaſtity, and therein *ſinne* if God ſhould *impute the ſame*. And therefore hee ſaith, that when [k] *concupiſcence thus in ſleepe ſtealeth a conſent, when chaſt ſoules hereby fall into conſent of filthineſſe, they mourne & grieue thereat when they are awake*. He teacheth his hearers [l] *not to to think much to aske God mercy for it, when concupiſcence ſo ſnareth them to do that to them when they are aſleepe, which it cannot doe when they are awake*. And this he himſelfe bemoneth to God cõcerning himſelfe, [m] *not only the delight, but alſo the conſent and act that he admitteth in his ſleep*, calling thoſe *laſciuious motions a ſickneſſe of the ſoule*, & ſaying that *the ſoule therein committeth a filthineſſe of corruption*, and lamenting that *in this kinde of euill he continued vnperfect ſtil*. Wherby it appeareth, that whatſoeuer *M. Biſhop* deeme of theſe dreaming fancies & conſents, yet that they are indeed a ſinfull corruption and vncleanneſſe of the ſoule, ſuch as God abhorreth, albeit to the faithfull he imputeth them not. And this haply God would haue to bee conſidered in that, that by the law he was *vncleane*, from whom by ſuch fancies [n] *the ſeed of generation* had iſſued by night, the outward vncleanneſſe ſeruing to aduertiſe of that that is within. And to the clearing of his whole point, that *ſin* may be where the will conſenteth not, we may very probably make application of ſundry other *pollutions* that are noted in the law of *Moſes*, ariſing of thoſe things which were either natural or caſuall, without any procuremẽt thereof by the will. Which *Gregory* plainely approueth, when ſpeaking of the womans monethly diſeaſe, for which by the law ſhee was vncleane, he ſaith thereof, that [o] *it is no ſin, becauſe it commeth naturally, but yet becauſe nature it ſelfe is ſo corrupted, as that without any furtherance of the will it is ſeene to be polluted, of ſinne came that infirmity, wherein the nature of man may take knowledge, in what caſe it is become by the iudgement of God, whileſt man that ſinned by his will, doth now beare the guilt of ſin by that that he is againſt his will*, euen by [p] *the delight (of concupiſcence) which he beareth in him againſt his will*, as hee expreſſeth it afterward. Let *M. Biſhop* therfore learne, that there is a pollution and vncleanneſſe which is not voluntary to him that is thereby vncleane, but lieth as a puniſhment vpon the nature

k *Ibid. Si quando ab eis vltà vel in ſomnis furatur aſſenſum, cũ exuigilanerint gemere compellit et inter gemitus dicere, Quomodo impleta eſt anima mea illuſionibus?*

l *De Temp. ſer. 45. Aliquando iſta concupiſcentia ſic inſidiatur ſanctis vt faciat dormientibus quod non poteſt vigilantibus: pudet hac immorari, ſed ne pigeat inde deũ precari.*

m *Confeſſ. lib. 10. cap. 30. In ſomnis occurſant mihi taliũ rerum imagines non ſolum vſui ad delectationem, ſed etiam vſq; ad conſenſionem factumque ſimillimũ &c.*

n *Potens eſt manus tua ſanare omnes languores animæ meæ, &c. Perpetrat iſtas corruptelarum turpitudines, &c. Lugens in eo quod inconſummatus ſũ, &c.*

o *Leuit. 15. 16. Gregor. apud Bedam hiſt. eccleſ. gent. Ang. lib. 1. cap. 27. Reſp. 10. Menſtrua conſuetudo multeribus non aliqua culpa eſt videlicet quia naturaliter accidit, ſed tamen quia natura ipſa ita vitiata eſt, vt etiam ſine voluntatis ſtudio videatur eſſe pollutæ, ex culpa venit vitium in quo ſeipſa qualiũ per iudicium facta ſit humana natura cognoſcat, vt homo qui cuſpam ſponte perpetrauit reatum culpæ portet inuitus. p. Ibid. Reſp. 11. in fine Caprinus ex delectatione quam portat inuitus.*

of

of man for that ſinne, that voluntarily was committed in the beginning by man. Which ſerueth him for anſwer to thoſe two places of *Auſtin* which he alledgeth, two as he citeth them, but indeed but one, and that in the booke and chapter which hee quoteth laſt; for in the other place *Auſtine* hath no ſuch words. He ſaith indeed, that [q] *ſinne is ſo voluntary an euill, as that in no wiſe it is ſin if it be not voluntary, and this is ſo manifeſt, as that neither the ſmal number of the learned, nor the multitude of the vnlearned do diſſent therefrom.* But as he ſaith ſo, ſo he himſelfe telleth vs in what meaning hee ſaith it, which *M. Biſhops* learning ſhould not haue bene ignorant of. [r] *It muſt be vnderſtood of that ſinne,* ſaith he, *which is onely ſinne, not which is alſo the puniſhment of ſin;* that is to ſay, of *Actuall,* not of *Originall ſinne.* But it is *Originall ſinne* whereof we here diſpute, and therfore by *S. Auſtines* owne interpretation, thoſe words make nothing againſt vs: albeit *Originall ſinne* alſo was voluntary by the will of the firſt man, as before was ſaid. Now therefore the *vnlearned learned men* of whom he ſpeaketh, are learned enough, to ſee that he wanted not onely learning, but diſcretion alſo thus to vrge againſt vs a ſaying of *Auſtine* againſt the Manichees, which the ſame *Auſtine* to ſalue it againſt the Pelagians, hath expounded in our behalfe directly againſt him.

q *August. de vera relig. cap. 14. ſupra. ſect. 2.*

r *Retract. lib. 1. cap. 13.*

## 12. W. BISHOP.

*The third reaſon for the Catholikes is this:* Where the forme of any thing is taken away, there the thing it ſelfe ceaſeth: but in baptiſme, the forme of Originall ſinne is taken away, *ergo* M. Perkins *ſhifteth in aſſigning a wrong forme: affirming vs to ſay, that the forme of Originall ſinne is the guiltineſſe of it: which we hold to be neither the forme, nor matter of it, but as it were the proper paſſion following it. See* S. Thomas: *who deliuereth for the forme of Originall ſinne, the priuation of Originall iuſtice, which iuſtice made the will ſubiect to God.*

1. 2. q. 8. art. 3.

6

*The deordination then of the will, Miſtres and commander of all other points in man, made by the priuation of originall iuſtice, is the forme of Originall ſinne: and the deordination of all other parts of man, (which by a common name is called concupiſcence, as that learned Doctor noteth,) is but the materiall part of that ſinne, ſo that the will of the regenerate being by grace through Chriſt rectified, and ſet again in good or-*

der

*der towards the law of God, the form of Originall sinne, which consisteth in deordination of it, is taken quite away by baptism, and so consequently the sinne it selfe, which cannot be without his proper forme, as the argument doth convince.*

R. ABBOT.

Of the first proposition of the argument there is no question, because the essentiall forme giueth to euery thing to be that that it is. The question then is, wherin consisteth the *forme* of sinne; what it is that giueth to it properly the nature & name of *sin*. *M. Bishop* saith, that *M. Perkins* [illegible] *in assigning a wrong forme:* yet he assigneth in their behalfe the same *forme* that *S. Austine* doth, and inasmuch as they make *S. Austine* the ground of their opinion, there is great reason, that they should vnderstand *sinne* in the same manner as *S. Austine* doth. But heerein appeareth their singular falshood, and they shew plainly that they alledge him but only for a color, knowing that if they take *sin* in the same meaning as he doth, their opinion cannot stand. Why do they bring vs *Austin* to proue for the, that *concupiscence is no sinne*; when in one meaning it is that he denieth it, and they deny it in another? *S. Austine*, as before I haue shewed, placeth the nature of *sinne* in the effect of it, which is, to make a man guilty. When it doth not so, he vnderstandeth it not to be *sinne*, opposing *sinne* not to *righteousnesse*, as we vnderstand it in this question, but to *remission and forgiuenesse of sinnes*. He saith, that [a] *to be guilty of sinne, is to haue sinne: not to be guilty of sinne, is to haue no sinne.* [b] *The baptized is without all sinne, but not without al euill, that is*, saith he, *he is without the guilt of all euill, not without the euill it selfe.* And thus much in infinite places he giueth to vnderstand. So farre therefore as *sinne* implieth *guilt*, he denieth *concupiscence* in the regenerate, to whom it is forgiuen, to bee any longer *sinne* because they are not thereby holden *guilty*, and in this we gainsay him not, because it is but as if he should say, that though in it selfe it be *sinne*, yet to the faithfull it is as it were no *sinne*, because it is not imputed for *sinne*, whereto willingly wee accord. But the question is, whether in it owne nature it bee not such, as that it should make *guilty*, saue onely that it is pardoned, and that did

a *August. de nupt & concup. lib. 1. cap 26. supra. sect. 9.*

b *Cont. Iulian. li. 6. ca. 5. supra. sect. 9.*

did *S. Auſtine* neuer deny, as before hath beene prooued: he confeſſeth it to be [c] *ſuch an euill, as ſhould draw vs vnto euerlaſting death, onely for being in vs, but that the guilt thereof is remitted.* Now this cannot be affirmed of any thing but that that is properly and truly *ſinne*, and therefore it cannot be doubted, but that *S. Auſtine* did take *concupiſcence* to be *ſinne*, according to the true and proper vnderſtanding of the name of *ſinne*. This true and proper nature of *ſinne*, is before ſhewed to conſiſt in a defect, obliquity or ſwaruing from the law of God. For the law of God is the true image and deſcription, and perfect rule of righteouſnes, and euery declining frō the rule of righteouſneſſe is vnrighteouſneſſe, and [d] *all vnrighteouſneſſe is ſinne*; therefore euery declining from the law of God, is *ſinne*. And this is ſo true, as that [e] *Pighius* in his time a maine pillar of the church of Rome, doth fully approue it, and maintaineth it with all his might, that it is a true and perfect definition of *ſinne*, which *S. Iohn* hath ſet downe, that *ſinne is the tranſgreſſion of the law*. Now becauſe the law requireth not onely outward actions, but alſo the inward fixed diſpoſition and quality of righteouſneſſe; not onelie works of charity, but alſo the inward habite of charity, whence all ſuch works are to proceed, it followeth, that if there bee a contrary quality or habite, the ſame is *ſinne*, becauſe it is a declining from the law. Seeing therefore concupiſcence not onely in the firſt acts & motions of it, but euen habitually is [f] *defectus à iuſtitia, a defecting or declining frō righteouſneſſe*, as *S. Auſtine* calleth it; ſeeing it is a very habituall [g] *enmity and rebellion againſt the law of God*, all *M. Biſhops* learning cannot auoid it, but that it muſt neceſſarily be concluded to be *ſinne*. But yet to giue ſome ſhew of auoiding it, he ſendeth vs to *Thomas Aquinas*, to learne of him now in the end of the world another forme and definition of *ſinne*, which is, *the deordination of the will*; ſo that howſoeuer other faculties and powers be diſtorted and corrupted, yet muſt we thinke there is no ſinne ſo long as there is an integrity and right diſpoſition of the wil. Which poſition is abſurdly falſe, becauſe *the loue of God* requireth [h] *all the heart, all the mind, all the ſoule, all the thought and ſtrength.* [i] *It endureth not that any ſtreame ſhould bee drawne from it, by the deriuing whereof it ſhould any way bee diminiſhed.* But the *will* of man is not the whole man, and therefore albeit there bee ſuppoſed a rectitude and integrity of the will, yet is not *ſinne* heereby excluded, if there

c *Ibid. vt ſupra.*

d 1. Iohn. 5. 17.

e *Pigh. de peccat. origin. cont. 1. Propriā veràque peccati rationem Ioannes explicat; peccatū eſt iniquitas, &c. id eſt, obliquatio à rectitudine quæ nobis lege præſcribitur aut legi tranſgreſſio.*

f *Auguſt. cont. Iulian. lib. 2.*

g Rom. 7. 23. et 8. 7.

h Deut. 6. 5. Luc. 10. 27.

i *Auguſt. de doct. Chriſt. lib. 1 ca. 22. Nullum à ſe riuulum duci extra patitur, cuius deriuatione minuatur.*

be a defect or failing in any other part. Yet that beeing graunted to *M. Bishop*, he is no whit the neerer to his purpose hereby. For if the deordination of the will be sinne, then concupiscence is *sinne*, because concupiscence is the deordination of the will. For it hath beene before declared, that [k] *concupiscence is nothing else but the will of man corrupted and serving sinne*, and therefore the remainder of *concupiscence* in the regenerate, is nothing else but a remainder of the corruption of the will, and according to that remainder, *a serving of the law of sinne*. Whereas then he affirmeth, that in baptisme *the deordination of the will is taken quite away*, it appeareth hereby that he is wholly deceiued, because so long as concupiscence remaineth, so long still there remaineth in part *a deordination of the will*. And indeed that *rectifying of the will* which he affirmeth, is but an *Idea*, a meere fantasticall speculation, contrary to the common sight and experience of all men. The defendour thereof sheweth a will naughtily resolued against conscience and truth. All men find, all men see and feele in themselues and others a great distortion, a crossenes, a crookednes and vntowardlinesse of will. And if there be that cure and healing of the will of which he speaketh, what hindereth that there is not perfect righteousnesse? For [l] *there should be perfect righteousnesse*, saith S. Austine, *if there were so great will at sufficeth for so great a matter*. And that *the will is lesse hereto then it ought to be*, [m] ex vitio est, *it is by reason of a corruption, an imperfection whereby there is somewhat wanting to the perfection of it*. And if there be still a *corruption*, and a want of perfection in the will, then the will is not yet fully rectified; and because the will is not yet fully rectified, sinne remaineth still, for sinne saith *M. Bishop*, is the deordination of the will. But it is further to be obserued, that to the perfect rectifying of the will, belong cleare light of vnderstanding and perfect delight of love. For [n] *therefore haue we not our will to that that is iust, either because they know it not to be iust, or because they delight not in it. For so much the more earnestly do we will any thing, by how much the more certainly we know how good it is, and more earnestly are delighted therin*. Therefore *ignorance and infirmity*, the one in the vnderstanding, and the other in the will it selfe, bring the [o] *two penalties of euery sinne of man*) are *defaults or corruptions hindering the will both in the doing of that that is good, and eschewing of that that is euill*. So long then as these *defaults* of *ignorance and infirmity*

k *Retract. lib. 1. cap. 15. Ipsa cupiditas vbi est aliud quam voluntas vitiosa, peccatoque seruiens?*

l *De spir. et lit. cap. 35. Fieret (per fecta iustitia) si tanta adhiberetur voluntas quanta sufficit ad id quod præcipitur in Epist. 29.*

m *De lib. arbit. lib. 3 ca. 14. Vitij nomen maximè solet esse corruptio. Quod perfectioni nature deesse perfectè vitium vocas vitium.*

o *De peccat. merit. remiss. lib. 2. cap. 17. Nolunt homines facere quod iustum est sine quia latet an iustum sit, sine quia non delectat. Tanto enim quisque vehementius volumus quanto certius quam bonum sit nouimus, eoq; delectamur ardentius. Ignorantia igitur & infirmitas vitia sunt quæ impediunt voluntatem ne moueatur ad faciendum opus bonum vel ab opere malo abstinendum.*

p *De nat. et grat. cap. 67. Pœnalis omni animæ ignorantia & difficultas.*

do

do remaine so long there cannot be a perfect rectifying of the will. But *ignorance and infirmity* are not taken away in baptisme. Therefore baptisme doth not wholy take away the deordination of the will. Of the former of these, it is manifest which S. *Ambrose* saith, [q] *All the Saints are in a shadow so long as they are in the body: they do not see perfectly, but know in part only.* He learned it of the Apostle saying: *We know in part, we prophecy in part; we see through a glasse darkely.* And if it might be so said of the Apostles, how much more is it to bee vnderstood of the common condition and state of men? We cannot but acknowledge much blindnes, much errour, much imperfection of knowledge, and therefore resolue that the vnderstanding cannot giue due information to the will. And so long as we are thus weake in knowledge, all other things must needs be vnperfect in vs, because we cannot loue beyond that we know, nor delight beyond our loue. Therefore our loue is vnperfect, our desire is vnperfect, our delight is vnperfect, and yet not onely because our knowledge is vnperfect, but also because we haue yet receiued not the perfection, but [s] *the first fruits* onely of *the spirit*, by whom all these things are effected in vs. For this cause *S. Austine* euery where acknowledgeth, that this *default of infirmity* continueth still in the regenerate, and that there is not perfect newnesse in the mind and inner man, as we haue seene before; by reason whereof the will is distracted and diuided in it selfe, and by one motion of it selfe fighteth against another, whilest [t] *we will one way, because we be in Christ, & will another way, because as yet we are in this world.* Now sith there is not by baptisme perfection of knowledge to direct the will, and the will it selfe by corruption yet remaining is infirme and weake to the loue and delight of the law of God, it cannot bee but absurdly said which *M. Bishop* saith, that the will in baptisme is *fully rectified and set in order againe towards the law of God.* Or if the meaning be, that it is *rectified and set in order*, but yet not fully and perfectly, then he saith as we say, that *the deordination of the will* continueth yet still in part, and because *sinne* consisteth in the *deordination of the will*, therefore *sinne* by baptisme is not altogether and wholy done away. Thus we see him very hardly bested, that in taking those himselfe, yet he cannot find one corner where he can in safety shrowd himselfe.

q *Ambros. in Psal. 118. ser. 3. Omnes sancti in umbra sunt quamdiu sunt in corpore non perfecte vident: sed ex parte cognoscunt.* 1 *Cor.* 13. 9.

s Rom. 8. 23.

t *August. in Iohan. tract. 81. supra sect. 1.*

13. W. BISHOP.

13. W. BISHOP.

4. *Obiect.* Laſtly ſaith *M. Perkins* for our diſgrace, they alledge that we in our Doctrine teach, that Originall ſinne after baptiſme, is only clipped or pared like the haire of a mans head, whoſe roots remaine in the fleſh, growing and increaſing after they bee cut as before. *His anſwer is*, that they teach in the very firſt inſtant of the conuerſion of a ſinner, ſinne to receiue his deadly wound in the root, neuer after to be recouered. *Conferre this laſt anſwer with his former doctrine (good Reader) and thou maieſt learne what credit is to be giuen to ſuch Maſters, no more conſtant then the wind.* Heere ſinne is deadly wounded in the root, there it remaineth ſtill with al the guiltineſſe of it, although not imputed, there it ſtill maketh the man to ſinne, intangleth him in the puniſhiment of ſinne and maketh him miſerable: *All this he comprehended before in this firſt reaſon, and yet bluſheth not here to conclude, that he holdeth it at the firſt:* Neither clipped nor pared, but pulled vp by the roots: *Indeed they doe him a fauour, who ſay that he holdeth ſinne to be clipped, and as it were razed, for albeit haire razed grow out againe, yet is there none for a ſeaſon: but this Originall ſinne of his is alwaies in his regenerate, in vigour to corrupt all his workes, and to make them deadly ſinnes. But let this ſuffice for this matter.*

R. ABBOT.

This obiection they haue borrowed of the Pelagian heretikes, who altogether denying Originall ſinne, and acknowledging onlie ſins actuall by voluntary imitation and cuſtome, defended that thoſe being pardoned and forgiuen in baptiſme, a man was made fully and perfectly without ſinne. When therefore the Catholike Biſhoppes and Paſtours of the Church, did teach that after baptiſme there was *concupiſcence* ſtill remaining, whence did grow euill motions and luſts, tempting and entiſing to ſinne and wickedneſſe, they heereupon fell to cauilling in this ſort, that [a] *ſinnes then were not wholly remitted, and that Baptiſme did not take away ſinnes, but onely pare them and ſhaue them ſo, as that the rootes did ſtill ſticke, whence other ſinnes ſhould grow againe in like ſort to bee cut off.* Now, this Saint *Auſtine* denieth, and teacheth that

[a] *Auguſt. lib. 1. de duas epiſt. Pelag. cap. 13. ſupra ſect. 9.*

baptiſme giueth to the regenerate b *remiſſion and releaſe of all ſins, and doth not pare off faults* (*crimina, faults of behauiour & conuerſation*) *but doth wholy take them away*, becauſe of actuall ſinnes, which onely and no other they acknowledged, there remaineth nothing when the ſame are forgiuen and pardoned. *But as touching concupiſcence*, ſaith hee, *I hold that they are deceaued and do deceiue others, with which the regenerate hath ſtill to fight, albeit he haue well profited, and beguided by the ſpirit of God.* Yet this he ſaith, *is no ſinne* to him, that is, it is not imputed for *ſinne*, becauſe *the guilt thereof drawn by generation, is remitted and forgiuen by regeneration.* Now this *concupiſcence*, as *S. Ambroſe* ſaith, is d *mala radix, an euill roote*; e *radix omnium malorum, the roote of all euils*, ſaith Auſtine, *euen as charity is the root of all goodneſſe*: f *from which* root of *concupiſcence* he ſaith againe, *that all ſinnes do ſpring and grow.* Thus *S. Auſtine* confeſſeth, that albeit there be remiſſion of ſinnes in baptiſme, and nothing remaining of any actuall ſinnes, yet the root af Originall ſinne continueth ſtill, which being the ſame that it was before, muſt needs be *ſinne* as it was before, albeit in reſpect that the guilt thereof is releaſed, hee forbeareth to call it by the name of ſinne. But of this *root M. Perkins* further ſaith and that rightly, that though it bee in ſubſtance the ſame that it was before; yet in extent and power and ſtrength, it is not the ſame. It holdeth not the whole man captiue as before; the yoke thereof is broken: the kingdome of it is diſſolued; it is as an enemy conquered and diſarmed, not hauing the g *members* at commandement, to be the *weapons of vnrighteouſneſſe vnto ſinne*, as before it had. *In the firſt inſtant of the converſion of a ſinner*, ſaith he, *ſinne receiueth his deadly wound in the root, neuer afterward to be recouered.* Now here *M. Biſhop* though he know not well what to ſay, yet to ſhew both his wit and his honeſty, would not forbeare to ſay ſomewhat. He wiſheth the Reader to *conferre this laſt anſwer* of *M. Perkins with his former doctrine*, bearing him in hand, that he ſhall find him *no more conſtant then the wind.* And why ſo? Forſooth he ſaith here, that *ſinne is deadly wounded in the roote*, & hath ſaid before, that *ſinne remaineth ſtill with all the guiltineſſe of it, though not imputed.* But what contradiction is there betwixt theſe two, that *ſinne is deadly wounded*, and yet *remaineth ſtill*? What hindereth, but that that which is *deadly wounded*, may truely be ſaid to *remaine ſtill*? *S. Auſtin* ſo ſpeaketh: h *It is dead as touching the guilt* where-

b *Dicimus baptiſma dare omnium indulgentiam peccatorum & auferre crimina non tradere, vt omnium peccatorum radices in mala carne remanſurus.*

c *Sed de iſta carnis concupiſcentia fallis eos credo vel fallere, cum qua neceſſe eſt vt etiam baptizatus et hoc ſi diligentiſſimè proficit: et ſpiritu dei agitur pia mente conflictat.*

d *Ambroſ. Apolog. Dauid cap. 13.*

e *Aug. de verb. Dom. ſerm. 12.*

f *Idem de verb. Apoſt. ſer. 6. Hoc peccati nomine appellat vnde oriuntur cuncta peccata id eſt, ex carnali cuncupiſcentia.*

g Rom. 6. 13.

h *Auguſt. cont. Iulian. lib. 2. ſupra. ſect. 9.*

*wherewith it held vs, and vntill it be healed by perfect burial, it ſtill rebelleth being dead.* Yea but *M. Perkins* ſaith, *it remaineth ſtill with all the guiltineſſe of it, although not imputed.* But I anſwer him, that he abuſeth *M. Perkins*, who for this matter ſtopped this wranglers mouth in the anſwer laſt before, and he diſſembleth it as though he ſaw it not. The guilt of *ſin* he ſaith remaineth *potentially*, not *actually*, that is, it remaineth ſuch as that in it owne nature it is ſufficient to make a man guilty, but yet it doth not ſo, becauſe the guilt thereof is remitted and pardoned, which *S. Auſtine* manifeſtly proueth, as I haue ſaid before. He doth not ſay then, that it remaineth with *all the guiltineſſe* of it, though not imputed, becauſe it cannot bee ſaid to remaine with *all the guiltineſſe* of it, but it muſt alſo be ſaid to be imputed. Therefore in this whole diſputation he confeſſeth with *S. Auſtine* as touching actuall guilt, that Originall ſinne is wholly and fully dead to the regenerate, but yet remaineth ſtill to rebel though it be dead. And yet as touching rebellion, it hath alſo receiued a *deadly wound*, becauſe it hath not now the ſame power to rebell, as it had before to raigne, and if ſometimes it do gather power againe, yet doth it neuer totally or finally recouer the kingdome that it had, or preuaile vtterly to ſeparate the faithfull from the loue of Chriſt, as naturally it doth, but by the firſt ſtroke and wound that it receiued by the grace of Chriſt, becommeth in the end euery way and altogether dead, and is vtterly aboliſhed, neuer to be againe. He further alleageth, that *M. Perkins* firſt ſaith, that *concupiſcence maketh a man to ſinne, intangleth him in the puniſhment of ſin, and maketh him miſerable*; and *yet here bluſheth not to conclude, that hee holdeth it at the firſt neither clipped nor pared, but pulled vp by the roots.* But where doth he find this concluſion in *M. Perkins* words? Surely the paper whereon hee wrote this, would haue bluſhed if it had had a forehead, for very ſhame, to cary the report of ſo manifeſt a lie. But let the paper doe what it will, *M. Biſhop* bluſheth not; for if he had been a man of a bluſhing face, he had wanted the name of being the writer of this booke. What, *M. Biſhop*, is it all one to bee deadly wounded in the root, and to bee pulled vp by the roots? *M. Perkins* ſaith not any where that concupiſcence or ſinne is *pulled vp by the roots*, but as a man hauing receiued a deadly wound, yet liueth afterwards for the time, and ſtirreth and moueth, euen ſo *concupiſcence* though it receiue a deadly wound, whereof in the end it

dieth, yet liueth, and ſtrugleth, and rebelleth for the time, ſtirring vp many noiſome and euill motions and luſts, from the conſent whereof no man can ſay that he is altogether free, and therein maketh a man to *ſinne, and intangleth him in the puniſhment of ſinne, and maketh him miſerable*, in ſuch ſort as before hath beene declared. I may heere turne *M. Biſhops* words vpon himſelfe, *Learne here, gentle Reader, what credit is to be giuen to ſuch Maſters as he is.* To ſuch Maſters did I ſay? nay to ſuch remorſeleſſe beaſts, who make no ſcruple or conſcience to lie, to falſifie, to depraue thoſe things againſt which otherwiſe they can haue nothing to except. As for that which he glanceth at in the end, that concupiſcence defileth all the workes of the regenerate, ſo that though they be in themſelues good works, yet they are ſtained with that, which though it be not imputed, yet is in itſelfe mortall and deadly ſinne, it hath beene in part already declared and prooued in the[1] anſwer to his Epiſtle Dedicatory, and ſhall be more fully handled in his due place in the queſtion of iuſtification, where he profeſſedly diſputeth of that matter.

1 *Sect.* 19.

CHAPTER

## CHAPTER 3.
# OF THE CERTAINTIE OF *SALVATION.*

### 1. W. BISHOP.
### M. PERKINS FIRST CONCLVSION.

WEE hold and beleue, that a man in this life, may be certain of ſaluation: and the ſame doth the Church of Rome teach. Pag. 37.

*M.P.2. Conclu.* We hold, that a man is to put certaine affiance in Gods mercy in Chriſt for the ſaluation of his ſoule: and the ſame holdeth the aforeſaid Romane Church.

*M. P. 3. Conclu.* We hold, that with aſſurance of ſaluation in our hearts is ioyned doubting, and there is no man ſo aſſured of his ſaluation, but he at ſometime doubteth thereof, eſpecially in the time of temptation: & in this the Papiſts agree with vs. *Not ſo Sir.*

*M.P.4. Conclu.* They go further and ſay, that a man may be certaine of the Saluation of men, and of the Church, by Catholike faith: and ſo ſay we.

*M.P.5. Conclu.* They hold, that a man by faith may be aſſured of his owne ſaluation, through extraordinary reuelation; *In this ſence onely the firſt concluſion is true.*

*M.P.6. Conclu.* The ſixt, and ſecond bee all one: that we may be aſſured of our Saluation, in regard of God that promiſeth it: though in regard of our ſelues, & our own indiſpoſition we cannot.

### *THE DISSENT.*

1. WE hold, that a man may be certaine of his ſaluation in his owne conſcience euen in this life, and that by an ordinary and ſpeciall faith. They hold, that a man is Certaine of his Saluation, only by hope, buth hold a certainty, wee by faith, they by hope.

2. We ſay our certainty is infallible: they, that it is onely probable.

3 Our confidence in Gods mercy in Christ, commeth frō certaine and ordinary faith, theirs from hope: *False. Thus much of the difference, now let vs come to the reasons, to and fro.*

R. ABBOT.

In this first diuision *M. Bishop* giueth vs only some briefe notes which need not to be stood vpon. In the third conclusion hee denieth their agreement with vs, but if he vnderstand it as *M. Perkins* doth of *ordinary assurance*, he had no cause to deny it. For seeing in the first conclusion of *dissent*, he graunteth *Certainty or assurance by hope*, and requireth therewith *doubting*, yea affirmeth still that it cannot be without *doubting*, what reason had he to denie the conclusion, beeing indifferently propounded of *assurance* afterwards more particularly to be distinguished, but that hee well knew not what he was to say? But in that conclusion, he should haue taken knowledge what manner of Certainty or assurance of Saluation it is that we teach, not such as whereby a man is meerely secure, and made absolutely out of doubt, but such as many times is assaulted and shaken with many difficulties, and feares, and doubts, which oft do intricate and perplexe the soule of the righteous and faithful man. Which notwithstanding arise not of the nature and condition of faith, as if it ought so to be, but of the frailty and corruption of our euill nature, by reason whereof faith is not such as it ought to be. For the true and proper worke of faith, is to giue to the beleeuer a stedfast and vnmoueable assurance of the loue of God, that he may fully enioy the comfort thereof without interruption or let; and whatsoeuer is aduerse and contrary to this assurance and comfort, is to be accounted the enemy of faith. Therfore it is not the office of faith to cherish and maintaine such feares and doubts, but to resist them, to fight against them, and so much as is possible to expell them and driue them out. But yet by reason of the strength of our naturall corruption and the weakenesse of our faith, we attaine not to this, and how much the weaker our faith is, so much are we the further from it. So that the case standeth betwixt faith and doubting, as it doth betwixt righteousnesse and sinne. For there is true righteousnesse in the faithfull, and sometimes it mightily preuaileth, and the conscience euen gratulateth

lateth it ſelfe, and reioiceth in the vſe and practiſe thereof. But anon it beginneth to find defect, the temptations of ſinne iuſtle it aſide, the man ſtumbleth & falleth, and the light whereby he ſhined before as a ſtarre in the firmament, becommeth eclipſed and darkned, and he ſeemeth to himſelfe not to be the man that he was before. Neither doth this ſeldome fall out, but euen daily is there a viciſſitude and change by turnes, euery day bringing his griefes of infirmity and weakneſſe, and ſometimes giuing occaſion of great lamentation and mourning, by great and grieuous treſpaſſe againſt God and men. But God that [a] *commandeth the light to ſhine out of darkeneſſe*, and can of a poyſon make a preſeruatiue, turneth theſe infirmities to their good, making them by experience of ſinne, to loue righteouſneſſe the more, and to become more wiſe and wary againſt temptation, and in riſing to take the better heede not to fal againe. Euen in like ſort the caſe ſtandeth with the aſſurance of faith, wherein is a comfortable teſtimony of the loue of God towards vs which we receiue as [b] *Elias* did his meate from the hands of the Angell, ſecuring our ſelues to goe in the ſtrength thereof vnto the mount of God, and that [c] *thereby we ſhall be kept through the power of God vnto that ſaluation, which is prepared to be ſhewed in the laſt time.* But yet in the courſe thereof there is much variety and change by reaſon that wee apprehend not this aſſurance directly and immediatly as a principle, but by conſequence and collection as a concluſion, ſo that being ſubiect to alteration in the apprehending of the premiſſes, there muſt neceſſarily be an alteration in the apprehending of the concluſion. Our eies are not alwaies alike intent to the word of God; wee doe not alwaies alike conceiue the promiſes of God, nay temptation ſometimes hideth them out of our ſight. The effects of grace doe not alwaies appeare the ſame, yea ſometimes they ſeeme to be quite ouerwhelmed with contrarie effects. Moreouer in nature it ſelfe is a voluntary ſhrinking and relinquiſhing of the comfort of faith, through the ſeedes of vnbeliefe that originally are ſowne in vs, ſo that the ground of our owne hearts is euery while caſting vp obiections and queſtions, as mire and dirt, to trouble [d] *the ſpring of the waters of life*, that they runne not ſo pure and cleare as otherwiſe they ſhould doe. By all which occaſions it commeth to paſſe, that the daies of faith are as the daies of the yeere, ſome faire, ſome foule; one while a ſunne-

[a] 2. Cor. 4. 9.

[b] 1. King. 19. 7. 8.

[c] 1. Pet. 1. 5.

[d] Ioh. 7. 38.

ſhine ſommer, another while a long and tedious winter, ſometimes no more but a ſtorme and away; one while caſt down as it were to hell, another while ſeeming to bee as it were in the courts of heauen, where is aſſured ſtanding and no falling; ſometimes labouring and ſtrugling, ſome other times triumphantly reioycing; but in all perplexities and diſtractions conceiuing ſtill what it hath felt, and ſtriuing to attaine to the ſame againe. And as a child affrighted runneth to the father, looking for defence and helpe of him, euen ſo in the middeſt of all feares and temptations, faith is ſtill running vnto God, ſtil importuning of him, calling vpō him, expoſtulating with him, caſting it ſelfe ſtill vpon him, depēding vpon his aid, and expecting of him that things become otherwiſe then preſentlie they are, and ſeldome going ſo far, but that it ſeeth a glimſe at leaſt of light in darkeneſſe, of hope in deſpaire, of comfort in diſtreſſe, of life in death, of heauen in hell, or if it loſe the ſight thereof, yet recouereth it ſoone againe. Of all which wee ſee pregnant example in the diſtreſſes and temptations of the Saints, which for our inſtruction and comfort, are recommended vnto vs in the word of God. And this God doth, to the intent that being in ſome ſort for the time put off from him, wee may take the faſter hold when we returne againe; that the taſt of his loue may be the ſweeter, and our ioy thereof the greater, when out of theſe flouds of temptations we arriue vnto it; that [e] *affliction may bring foorth patience, and patience experience, and experience hope neuer to bee aſhamed, whileſt* by this meanes *the loue of God* as touching the aſſurance therof towards vs, is more and more *ſhed abroad in our hearts by the holy Ghoſt which is giuen vnto vs.* This haue I ſet downe the more largely, good Chriſtian Reader, for thy ſake, that thou maieſt vnderſtand hereby what manner of certainety and aſſurance it is that we defend; that thou maieſt know that it is the property of true faith to giue this aſſurance, and that our aſſurance is the greater, by how much our faith is greater, and the weakneſſe of our aſſurance the weakenſſe of our faith; that ſo thou maieſt ſee what it is whereunto thou art to ſtriue, reioicing in that that thou haſt attained vnto already, and for that that is behind praying as the Apoſtles did, [f] *Lord increaſe our faith*; not being diſcōforted at the feeling of thine imperfection, becauſe it is the cōmon frailty of Gods children, and faith that it may be ſtrong, muſt haue time and occaſion to grow, and

e Rom. 5. 3.

f Luc. 6. 75.

and haply seemeth weake to thee when it is strong to God; but alwaies resoluing, that those sparkels of true light which God hath kindled in thee shall neuer be quenched, and thy little *graine of faith*, euen [g] *little as a graine of mustard seed*, shall yet be strong enough to cast all *mount anes into the sea* that shall rise vp to diuide betwixt God and thee. As for *M. Bishop*, it is no maruell if being an enemy of faith, he be vnacquainted with the secret of faith, the ioy of the faithfull being [h] *as a garden inclosed, and a spring and fountaine shut & sealed vp* to be priuate to themselues; [i] *a gracious raine, which God hath put apart for the refreshing of his owne inheritance.* What maruell is it if hee know not that [k] *new name which no man knoweth but he that receiueth it*, because the [l] *world knoweth not nor receiueth that* COMPORTER *the spirit of truth*, by which it is written, yet grudgeth at the sheepe of Christ, that they should feed in pastures which they know not, or should bee said to know that which they cannot conceiue or vnderstand. And this is the cause that he talketh so rudely and absurdly of the hope of saluation in all this discourse, ouerthrowing the whole doctrine of the Gospell, crossing the whole vse of faith and of the word of God, and speaking no otherwise of this question then a Philosopher, or Iew, or Pharisee would do, as hereafter we shall see. In the meane time to go forward with his briefe notes, he telleth vs in the fift conclusion of consent, that only in the *sence* there expressed, the first conclusion is true, that is, that onely by extraordinary reuelation a man may be certaine of his saluation, which being the maine point of the controuersie, I referre to the processe of this discourse. At the sixt conclusion he noteth, that *the sixt and second are all one*, but the *tautology* was in his head, not in *M. Perkins* writing. For the second conclusion serueth to note the efficient and materiall causes of saluation, whereupon our affiance resteth, which is *the mercy of God in Christ*; but the sixt serueth to note the manner of our apprehending thereof. To the third conclusion of dissent, he noteth that it is false, namely that our confidence in Christ commeth from certaine and ordinary faith. But we say that it is true, and now he and I must ioine vpon that issue.

[g] Mat. 17. 20 Mar. 11. 23.

[h] *Cant. 4. 12.* Bernard. *Epist. 107. Est fons signatus cui alienus non communicat; sed iustitiae qui timentibus Deum tãtum oritur, &c.*

[i] Psal. 68. 9.

[k] Reuel. 2. 17.

[l] Iohn 14. 17.

### 2. W. Bishop.

*Here* M. Perkins *contrary to his custome giueth the first place to our reasons, which he calleth obiections, and endeauoureth to supplant them: and afterwards planteth his owne. About the order I will not contend, seeing he acknowledgeth in the beginning that he obserueth none, but set downe things as they came into his head. Otherwise hee would haue handled Iustification before Saluation. But following his method, let vs come to the matter.*

*The first Argument for the Catholike party is this.*

1. *Obiect.* Where is no word of God, there is no faith, for these two are Relatiues. But there is no word of God: saying, *Cornelius* beleeue thou, *Peter* beleeue thou that thou shalt be saued: therefore there is no such ordinary faith, for a man to beleeue his owne particular saluation.

*M. Perkins answer.*

Although there bee no word of God to assure vs of our particular saluation: yet is there an other thing as good, which counteruailes the word of God, to wit, the Minister of God applying the generall promises of saluation vnto this and that man. Which when hee doth, the man must beleeue the Minister, as hee would beleeue Christ himselfe, and so assure himselfe by faith of his saluation.

Reply. *Good Sir seeing euery man is a lyar, and may both deceiue, and be deceiued, and the Minister telling may erre, how doth either the Minister know, that the man to whom he speaketh is of the number of the elect; or the man be certaine that the Minister mistaketh not, when hee assureth him of his Saluation? To affirme as you do, that the minister is to be beleeued aswel as if it were Christ himselfe, is plaine blasphemy: equalling a blind and lying creature vnto the wisdome and truth of God. If you could shew out of Gods word, that euery minister hath such a commission from Christ, then had you answered the argument directly, which required but one warrant of Gods word: but to say that the assurance of an ordinary ministers word counteruailes Gods word, I cannot see what it wanteth of making a pelting minister Gods mate. On the other side, to auerre that the minister knowes who is predestinate (as it must be granted, he doth if you will not haue him to lie when hee saith to* Peter, *thou art one of the elect,) is to make him of Gods priuy Councell,*

*eeli, without any warrant for it in Gods word: Yea* S. Paul *not obscurely signifying the contrarie in those words.* The sure foundation of God standeth, hauing this seale: our Lord knoweth who bee his, *and none else, except he reueale it vnto thē.* M. Perkins *then flieth from the assurance of the Minister, and leaues him to speake at randon, as the blind man casts his club; & attributeth all this assurance vnto the parte himselfe, who hearing in Gods word,* Seeke ye my face, *in his heart answereth:* Lord I wil seek thy face. *And then hearing God say,* Thou art my people, *saith again:* The Lord is my God. *And then lo without al doubt he hath assurance of his Saluatiō. Would ye not think that this were rather some seely old womans dreame, then a discourse of a learned Man? How know you honest man, that those words of God spoken by the Prophet 2000. yeares past to the people of Israell, are directed to you? Mine owne heart, good Syr, tels mee so. How dare you build, vpon the perswasion of your own hart any such assurance? When as in holy writ it is recorded:* Wicked is the heart of man, and who shall know it? *Are you ignorant, how* Saul *before he was* Saint Paul, *being an Israelite, to whom those words appertained, perswading himselfe to be very assured of his faith, was notwithstanding foully deceiued, and why may not you farre more vnskilfull then he, bee in like manner abused? Moreouer suppose that this motion commeth of the holy Ghost, and that he truely saith,* The Lord is God, *how long knoweth hee that he shall be able to say so truely? When our Sauiour Christ Iesus assureth vs that many be called, but few of them are chosen to life euerlasting; how knoweth he then assuredly, that he being once called, is of the predestinate?* M. Perkins *saith, that hee who beleeueth, knoweth that he beleeueth. Be it so; if he beleeue aright, and medle no further then with those things, which bee comprehended within the bounds of faith: But that the Certainety of Saluation is to be beleeued, is not to be begged but proued, being the maine question: he saith further, that he who truely repenteth, knoweth that hee repenteth; hee knoweth indeed by many probable coniectures, but not by certaintie of faith: as witnesseth that holy person:* If God come to me, (*as hee doth to all repentant sinners,* I shall not see him, and if he depart away from me, I shall not vnderstand it: *Which is sufficient to make him thankefull, yea if he receiued no grace at all, yet were he much beholding vnto God, who offered him his grace, and would haue freely bestowed it vpon him, if it had not beene through his owne default. And thus our first argu-*

2. Tim. 2. 19.

Iere. 17.

Math. 22.

Iob. 9.

*ment:*

*must stand in his full strength and vertue, that no man can assure himselfe by faith of his Saluation, because there is no word of God that warranteth him so to do.*

R. ABBOT.

He was beholding to *M. Perkins*, that their reasons being no better then they be, he did vouchsafe here to giue them the first place. By the first of these reasons, they labour to defeate vs af all profitable vse of the word of God, denying vs libertie to beleeue any thing particularly of our selues, because the word of God doth no where speake namely and particularly to any of vs. *M. Perkins* rightly answereth, that God hath appointed the ministerie and preaching of his word, for the particular application thereof, whilest thereby it is layed to the hart and conscience of euery particular man, so as that by the word of Christ deliuered out of the Gospell by the minister, Christ himselfe in effect saith, *Cornelius* beleeue thou, and thou shalt be saued, *Peter* beleeue thou, and thou shalt be saued. *M. Bishop* somewhat deformeth the answer by his butcherly and slouinly handling of it, as his manner is, but thogh in more words, it is to the same meaning that I haue mentioned. Now *M. Perkins* intended not in that answer, that the minister speaketh to euery man particularly one by one, but that speaking to the assembly, he laboureth to make euery man conceiue of that that is spoken as particularly spoken to himselfe. For the word of God being as a Proclamation in writing common to all, the minister is as the *voyce of the crier*, to giue notice to that congregation, that the matter of the Proclamation concerneth them and euery of them, saying in effect. [a] *To you is the word of this Saluation sent* [b]. *Vnto you hath God raised vp his sonne Iesus, and hath sent him to blesse you, in turning euery one of you from your iniquities.* [c] *Now then wee are Ambassadors for Christ; as though God did beseech you through vs, we pray you in Christs steed that ye be reconciled to God.* [d] *Amend your liues euery one of you, &c.* Therefore as euery man conceiueth the proclamation, according to the matter of it, no lesse to concerne him, then as if it had bene spoken in particular to him alone, so doth the minister leaue euerie man alike interested in the message of Saluation; what he saith to all men, he saith to euerie man;

a Act. 13. 26.
b Cap. 3. 26.
c 2. Cor. 5. 20.
d 2. Act. 2, 38.

man; what to penitents, to euery penitent; what to beleeuers, to euery beleeuer; what to sinners, to euery sinner. Therefore sometimes he speaketh in the singular number as to one, that it may bee knowne that he speaketh to any or euery one. [e] *Awake thou that sleepest, and stand vp from the dead, and Christ shall giue thee light.* [f] *If thou shalt confesse with thy mouth the Lord Iesus, and beleeue in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be safe,* euen thou, or thou, or thou, or whosoeuer it bee amongst you. Thus God gaue his Law to all Israel, speaking to all, as if he had spoken namely and particularly to euery one, [g] *Thou shalt haue none other gods: Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen image: Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord in vaine, &c.* euery man was therein to conceiue that hee himselfe was spoken to. Thus the message both of life and death, both of Saluation and damnation is deliuered, that thereby euery man particularly may take knowledge of his owne estate. Therefore a man duely hearing the word of God, and receiuing it not as the word of the minister, [h] *not as the word of man, but as it is indeed the word of God,* and accordingly beleeuing it as from God, from that which he beleeueth generally, frameth a conclusion to bee beleeued priuatly as touching himselfe: The Minister saith, [i] *Except ye repent, ye shall perish.* This he beleeueth, and therefore beleeueth as touching himselfe, Except I repent, I shall perish. The Minister saith [k] *Repent and beleeue the Gospell,* and ye shall be saued. This he beleeueth, and therefore also beleeueth of himselfe, If I repent and beleeue the Gospell I shall bee saued. Now the Minister sometimes hath occasion to speake to some one man alone, and then hee himselfe out of the generall deduceth a particular to that one man, as *Paul* doth to the iayler, [l] *Beleeue thou in the Lord Iesus and thou shalt be saued.* For by what authority *Paul* spake this to the iayler, by the same authority doth the Minister in the like case speake the same to any other man. For Christ said nothing namely as touching the iayler, that if hee did beleeue he should be saued, but onely said, [m] *whosoeuer beleeueth shall be saued.* Thence the Apostle inferreth: *Beleeue thou and thou shalt be saued,* because *whosoeuer beleeueth shall be saued.* Vpon the same warrant therefore the Minister saith to any man vpon the like occasion, *Beleeue thou and thou shalt be saued.* This, whether spoken publikely or priuatly the conscience of the hearer apprehendeth,

[e] Eph. 5. 14.
[f] Rom. 10. 9.
[g] Exod. 20. 3.
[h] 1. Thes. 2. 13.
[i] Luc. 13. 3.
[k] Mar. 1. 15. & 16. 15. 16.
[l] Act. 16. 31.
[m] Iohn 3. 15.

this

this hee beleeueth, and therein beleeueth not the minister, but the word of Christ, and becauſe hee beleeueth in Ieſus Christ, and by the word of Christ beleeueth that *whoſoeuer beleeueth in him ſhall bee ſaued*, therefore hee beleeueth concerning himſelfe that he ſhall be ſaued. Thus much is implied though not expreſſed in *M. Perkins* anſwer. Now let vs heare what *M. Biſhop* ſaith to the contrarie, and there wee ſhall heare not one wiſe word. *Good Sir*, ſaith hee, *ſeeing euerie man is a lier* (as *M. Biſhop* namely for example) *and may both deceiue and bee deceiued, and the minister telling may erre, how doth hee know that the man to whom hee ſpeaketh is of the number of the elect?* I anſwer him: Good Sir, *M. Perkins* no where telleth you that the minister taketh vpon him to knowe that the man to whom hee ſpeaketh is of the number of the elect, but doth onely aſſure him, that if hee beleeue in Christ hee ſhall be ſaued; and therein the minister knoweth, and the man to whom he ſpeaketh knoweth *that he miſtaketh not, when* vnder this condition he *aſſureth him of ſaluation*, becauſe he aſſureth him not vpon any deceiueable word or warrant of his owne, but vpon the vndeceiueable word and warrant of Christ, that [n] *whoſoeuer beleeueth in him ſhall not be confounded.* He goeth on: *To affirme as you doe, that the Miniſter is to bee beleeued as well as if it were Chriſt himſelfe, is plaine blaſphemy.* I anſwer him againe, To talke as you doe, you knowe not what, is the part of a brabling Sophiſter, not of a learned diuine. For *M. Perkins* doth not affirme that the minister is to bee beleeued as well as Christ himſelfe, but that the word of the Goſpell preached by the minister, is to bee beleeued as if Christ himſelfe did here perſonally ſpeake, becauſe it is the word of Christ himſelfe, who when hee ſaith, *whoſoeuer beleeueth ſhall bee ſaued*, doth therein ſay, *Cornelius*, beleeue and thou ſhalt be ſaued; *Peter* beleeue and thou ſhalt bee ſaued, or if he meane not ſo, cannot truly ſay, *whoſoeuer beleeueth ſhall be ſaued.* And for this hee hath the warrant of Gods word, and commiſſion from Christ, becauſe being for Christ a minister of the Goſpell, his office is to preach the Goſpell, and it is the word of the Goſpell, that *whoſoeuer beleeueth in Chriſt ſhall haue euerlaſting life.* Therefore this is not to ſay, that the miniſters word counteruailes Gods word, or to make euerie pelting miniſter Gods mate, as the paltry ſhaueling prateth, but it is to challenge aſſent and credit to the word of God, to the Goſpell

[n] Rom. 9. 33.

of

of Christ, vpon which onely and not vpon the minister, the faithfull beleeuer doth rely himselfe. But to quit *M. Bishop* with a question we will ask him, Good Sir, may *Iohn a Stile* beleeue that you haue authority from Christ to giue him absolution of all his sinnes? You will vndoubtedly tell him, Yes, that he must so in any case. But *Iohn a Stile* asketh againe, I pray Sir, where doth Christ speake of you or of me? For I do not find in the Gospell that euer Christ made mention of either of vs. *M. Bishop* will tell him, that Christ said to the Apostles, & to all priests their successors, ° *Whose soeuer sinnes ye remit, they are remitted*, and because hee is a Priest, therefore this authority belongeth to him. So then because Christ hath sayd to all Priests, *whose sinnes ye remit they are remitted*, though he sayd it to farre other purpose then *M. Bishop* practiseth it, therefore *Iohn a Stile* must beleeue that *M. Bishop* hath authority from Christ to absolue him from all his sinnes. Now will not *M. Bishop* be so fauourable to vs, as that from a generall we may inferre a particular, as well as he? Surely if when Christ said, *Whose sinnes ye remit they are remitted*, hee spake in effect of *M. Bishop* and *Iohn a Stile*, we see no reason why we should not be permitted the like construction, that when Christ saith, *Whosoeuer beleeueth in me shall not perish but haue euerlasting life*, he saith, and by the minister may be reported to say in effect to this man or that man, Beleeue thou in the Lord Iesus and thou shalt haue eternall life. This matter need not so many words, but that we haue to do with impudent wranglers, who being blinded with malice are as farre from commō discretion as they are from truth. Whereupon it is that in the next words hee cauilleth againe, as if *M. Perkins* had said that the minister *knowes who is predestinate*, or did say to *Peter*, for example, *Thou art one of the elect*, whereas hee hath not a letter or syllable to giue any shew hereof, but onely expresseth a conditionall assurance by the word of the Gospell to this man, or that man, or whomsoeuer, that if he repent and beleeue the Gospell, he shall be saued, the minister not taking vpon him to know that any man truly repenteth or beleeueth, which God onely can know, but leauing the man to apprehend the promise vpon conscience of his owne repentance and faith in Christ. Therefore all this idle talke of *M. Bishops* is but for want of matter, as his alledging of the words of the Apostle, to proue that whereof there is no question made,

° John 20. 23.

that

that the Lord onely knoweth who are his, and none elſe but only as it is reuealed from him. He goeth on and telleth vs, that *M. Perkins flieth from the aſſurance of the miniſter, and leaues him to ſpeak at random as the blind man caſts his club.* But *M. Perkins* flieth from nothing that he had before ſayd, but ſtill leaueth the word of Chriſt onely preached by the miniſter in Chriſts name, to be the onely aſſurance for the faithfull to build vpon. Neither doth the miniſter ſpeak at random, but certainly and definitely he affirmeth by the ſame word to him that repenteth and beleeueth, that he ſhall be ſaued, though he know not who it is that ſhall repent or beleeue and ſo be ſaued; and therefore in that reſpect, if *M. Biſhop* will needs haue it ſo, ſpeakes at random euen as the blind man caſts his club, not knowing whom he ſhal ſtrike; as the fiſherman caſts his net, not knowing what fiſh he ſhall catch; no otherwiſe then the Apoſtles did, at whoſe preaching ſome beleeued, other ſome blaſphemed and beleeued not, according to that which *S. Auſtin* faith, [p] *Many heare the word of truth; ſome of them beleeue it, ſome contradict and ſpeake againſt it.* So therfore the miniſter as touching the effect of preaching, ſpeaketh vncertaintly, not knowing where the ſeed ſhall grow, but yet certainely deliuering, that whereſoeuer it ſhall bring forth the fruit of faith, it ſhal alſo bring forth eternal life. Which aſſurance hee giueth by the word of Chriſt, and the faith of the hearer thence apprehendeth, and thereof concludeth aſſurance to himſelfe. Thus doth *M. Perkins* referre the aſſurance to the miniſtery of the word, and thus to the party, and no otherwiſe after then hee had done before. But to diſtinguiſh true aſſurance of the heart from carnall preſumption and floating fancies ſwimming in the head, he noteth it to be accompanied with the ſpirit of grace and of prayer, or rather to iſſue therefrom, by which the heart is ſo ſeaſoned and conformed to the voice of God, as that his word doth ſtill rebound from it by ioyfull acceptance and affectionate deſire, and prayer, and purpoſe, and promiſe of that that is vttered thereby. So that when God ſaith, [q] *Seeke ye my face,* the faithfull ſoule anſwereth to God, *Thy face Lord will I ſeeke.* When God ſaith, [r] *Thou art my people,* it ſoundeth from it backe againe, *Thou art the Lord my God.* When Chriſt ſaith, [s] *If thou beleeue, all things are poſſible to him that beleeueth,* it anſwereth, *Lord I beleeue, helpe my vnbeleefe.* When God requireth to [t] *doe his will,* it

p *Auguſt. de præd. ſanct. cap. 6.*

q Pſal. 27. 8.

r Zach. 13. 9.

s Mar. 9. 23.

t Pſal. 40. 7. 8.

it saith to him, *Lo I come O my God, I am content to do it, yea thy Law is within my heart.* This is the fruit and effect of that [u] *spirit of adoption, which giueth witnesse to our spirit, that we are the Sonnes of God,* and [x] *beareth record that God hath giuen vnto vs eternal life.* Which we doe not wonder, that to *M. Bishop* it seemeth rather *an old womans dreame, then a discourse of a learned man,* because [y] *the things of God seem but babling and foolishnesse* to prophane and carnall men. And out of that prophanesse issueth that speech of his that followeth, *How know you, honest man, that those words of God spoken by the Prophet 2000. yeares past to the people of Israel are directed to you, &c.* Where many an honest and faithful soule is ready to answer him, *Good Sir,* because [z] *whatsoeuer things were written before-time, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scripture, might haue hope,* and because I find that the Scripture it self doth apply to euery of Gods faithfull people, that that was said to *Iesuah,* [a] *I will not faile thee nor forsake thee,* and teacheth thereupon euerie faithfull soule to say as *Dauid* did, [b] *The Lord is on my side, I will not feare what man can doe vnto me,* therefore I [c] *hauing obtained mercy to be faithfull,* doe in like sort take to my selfe whatsoeuer God hath any where spoken for the comfort of his elect, & the rather because I know that God [d] *being one Father of all,* careth without respect of persons, the like regard to al his children. Neither is it mine own hart that giueth me this assurance, for mine owne heart could minister no such comfort vnto me, but being cast downe with the acknowledgement of mine own misery, God gaue me a heart to hearke to the voice of Christ, deliuered by the minister out of the Gospel, [e] *Come vnto me all ye that labor & are heauy laden and I will refresh you,* and I found in him indeed that *refreshing and ioy* [f] *that no man shall take from me.* And though I be a sinner, yet that dismaieth me not, for [g] *Christ came into the world to saue sinners,* repentant sinners, of which by the grace of Christ I am one. And though *Paul* were deceiued when he builded himselfe vpon himself, yet when he built vpon Christ, as I do, he was not deceiued. And whereas you aske me, Sir, whether I know how long I shall say so, I must tell you that my assured trust & confidence is, that God will neuer forsake the worke which he hath begun, because he hath said, that [h] *he that beleeueth in Christ, shall neuer be confounded or ashamed,* that is [i] *his hope shall not be deceiued,* and Christ hath taught me that *his sheepe which heare his voice,* of which I am one, *shall neuer perish* [k] *but that he will giue vnto them eternall life.* And howsoeuer I know that the wickednesse & corruption of mine owne heart is such, that being left vnto my self, I should soone fall away frō God, yet I looke vnto that pro-

u Rom. 8. 16. x 1. Ioh. 5. 6.

y Act. 17. 18. 1. Cor. 1. 14.

z Rom. 15. 4.

a Iosu. 1. 9. Heb. 13. 5.

b Psa. 118. 6

c 1. Cor. 7. 25

d Eph. 4. 6.

e Matt. 11. 28.

f Ioh. 16. 22.

g 1. Tim. 1. 15

h Rom. 9. 33.

i *August. in Psa. 36. conc. 2.*

k *Infra sect. 20.* Ioh. 10. 28.

k Jere.32.40 miſe that God hath made to all his faithfull ſeruants, k *I will put my feare into their harts, that they ſhall not depart from me,* reſting my ſelfe not only
l Phil.3.12. in this, that *I haue apprehended Chriſt,* but much more in that l *that he hath apprehended me*; not only in this, that *I know God,* but much more in this,
m Gal.4.9. m *that I am knowne of God.* Neither doth it touch mee that you ſay, that *many are called but few are choſen,* for many are called which come not indeed though they ſeeme to come, and thereby ſhew that they are not
n *Auguſt. de predeſt. ſanct. ca.16. Ex vocante non quacunque vocatione, ſed qua vocatione ſic credens.* choſen, but there is a calling, n *whereby God ſo calleth, as that he maketh a man to beleeue,* of which Chriſt ſaith, o *Euery one that heareth & learneth of the Father commeth vnto me,* & of which S. *Paul* ſaith: p *Whom he hath predeſtinate, he hath called, and whom he hath called, he hath iuſtified and glorified.* Of which inward and effectual calling, he hath made me partaker, opening the eares of my ſoule to hearken vnto him, & ſubduing the affections of my heart to the obedience of his will. And becauſe q *the gifts and calling of God are without repentance,* therefore I reſt vndoubted, that
o Ioh.6.45. p Rom.8.30. q Ibid.11.29. r *if I liue, I ſhall liue vnto the Lord, and if I die I ſhall die vnto the Lord, & whether I liue or die, I am the Lords,* s *neither ſhal any thing ſeparate me from the loue of God, which is in Chriſt Ieſus our Lord.* Thus many an honeſt faithful chriſtian would anſwer *M. Biſhop,* & ſtop his mouth as the poore
r Ibid.14.8. s Ibid.8.39. t *Ruffin.hiſt. lib.1.cap.3.* t ſimple man did the mouth of the proud Philoſopher in the Councell of *Nice,* that he could not tell for his life what to reply againſt him. But let vs aske him in the behalfe of this honeſt man, whereas hee ſaieth u afterwards, that he beleeueth that he ſhall haue life euerlaſting, if he fulfill that which Chriſt taught the yong man in the Goſpel, to wit, if he keep all Gods commandements, how he knoweth that thoſe words of Chriſt ſpoken to the yong man ſo many hundred yeares paſt, are directed vnto him, or that ther is any ſuch cõdition made with him, that if he keep the commandements he ſhall enter into life. Looke by what rule he ſhal anſwer vs that that condition belongeth to him, that if he keep the cõmandements he ſhal enter into life, by the ſame rule doth the *honeſt man* take vpon him to beleeue, that becauſe he beleeueth in Chriſt he ſhall haue euerlaſting life. By the ſame rule doth he hearken to all the promiſes of God as pertaining to him. By the ſame rule doth he intereſt himſelfe in all the gracious & louely ſpeeches, wherwith God from time to time hath cõforted his people, & therfore as occaſion ſerueth he putteth himſelf into the perſon & condition of the ſaints & faithful that formerly haue bin, into their ioies & ſorows, & hopes, & feares, & praiers, & complaints, taking vnto himſelfe thoſe anſwers and aſſurances that God hath at any time giuen vnto them, reſoluing of all the reſt that which in one caſe the
u Sect.3.

Apoſtle

Apoſtle exẽplifieth of that that was written of the iuſtification of *Abrahã*, [x] *that thoſe things were not writẽ for thẽ only but for vs alſo which beleeue* as they haue done, that we may be aſſured that God will bee the ſame God to vs as he hath bin to thẽ. As for certainty of perſeuerãce & teſtimony of predeſtinatiõ & election, more followeth to be ſaid hereafter. But here he confeſſeth, *that he that beleeueth knoweth that he beleeueth*; wherof we infer, that then he knoweth and beleeueth that he hath eternall life, becauſe [y] *they that beleeue in the name of the Son of God, are to know that they haue eternall life*: which is not to be excepted from being within the bounds of faith, becauſe *S. Iohn* hath ſo deliuered by the word of faith, & therfore that the certainty of ſaluatiõ is to be beleeued, is not begged but proued, & ſhal yet further be proued if God wil. *M. P.* ſaith, that *he that truly repẽteth, knoweth that he repẽteth*. *M. B.* anſwereth, that *he knoweth it indeed by many probable coniectures, but not by certainty of faith*, as if we made our repẽtance & faith the matters of our faith to beleeue that we beleeue, or to beleeue that we repẽt, illely talking he knoweth not what. Our faith & repẽtãce are not matters of faith, but matters of cõſcience & feeling, which in our affections we diſcern & know; & finding the ſame in our ſelues, do beleeue the word of God, that *he that repẽteth & beleeueth in the Son of God hath euerlaſting life*. As for that which he ſaith, that a mã knoweth his repẽtance no otherwiſe but by probable cõiectures, it is a ridiculous deuice. He that repẽteth knoweth further thẽ by cõiecture the woũd of his own hart, & the grieuance that he hath towards himſelf, by the cõſciẽce of his owne ſin. Surely if he himſelf had euer truly repẽted, he wold make it no queſtiõ whether he that repẽteth doth know himſelf to repẽt or not, but hitherto he hath bin vnacquainted, what either repẽtãce or faith do mean; God giue him the true knowledge thereof before it be too late. But to proue that a mã knoweth not his own repẽtãce but by *probable cõiectures*, he brings a place of *Iob* moſt abſurdly & impertinẽtly: *If god come to me I ſhal not ſee him, & if he depart frõ me I ſhal not vnderſtãd it*: which words of *Iob* rightly trãſlated, [z] *Whẽ he goeth by me I ſee him not, & whẽ he paſſeth by I perceiue him not*, do ſerue to ſet forth to vs the vnſearchablenes of the waies & works of God, which we are not able to cõprehẽd euẽ in thoſe things which are by vs & before vs, & wherin he ſeems moſt neerly to approach vnto vs. But let vs take the words as he reads thẽ, & I pray thee gẽtle Reader to obſerue in what ſort he vſeth thẽ. The thing that he wold proue, is that a mã knoweth not his own repẽtãce but by probable cõiectures: & how is proued?

[x] Rom. 4. 23, 24

[y] 1. Iohn 5. 13

[z] Iob 9. 11.

Becauſe we ſee not nor vnderſtand Gods cõing to vs or departing frõ vs. Wherupõ he inferreth, *which is ſufficient to make a man thãkful: yea though he receiued no grace, yet were hee beholding to God who offred him his grace, & wold haue freely beſtowed it on him, if it had not bin through his owne default.* Now what is that that is ſufficient to make the man thãkful? that he knoweth not his own repẽrãce? that he neither ſeeth nor vnderſtãdeth Gods cõming to him nor departing frõ him? If gods viſitatiõ be not perceiued nor vnderſtood, what thãks can there be or conuiction of vnthãkfulnes? Doth a man thank God & not know for what, or whether there be any thing or not to thãk him for? how doth he know any default in this caſe, or cã ſay that God offered him any grace, or that he wold freely haue beſtowed the ſame vpõ him? Out of doubt his wits were a woolgathering whẽ he wrot this, or elſe his hãd outrã his head; yet haply he thoght it good enough for them to whõ he ment it, who muſt think of their ghoſtly father, that he ſpeaks moſt lernedly whẽ they vnderſtãd him leaſt. But let me anſwer him to the place, that indeed we ſe not God, nor perceiue him cõming to vs, or departing frõ vs, but yet we feel him working in vs, & as *Ber.* noteth by the alteratiõ that we find in our ſelues, take occaſiõ to ſay [a] *Hæc eſt mutatio dexteræ excelſi: This chãge cometh of the right hãd of the moſt high:* Of this viſitatiõ *Cypriã* ſpeaks moſt fitly for our purpoſe [b] *As the lightning breketh the clouds, & the ſuddẽ ſhining therof doth not ſo much enlightẽ as dul the eie ſo ſometimes thou art touched with I know not what motiõ, & feeleſt thy ſelf to be touched, & yet ſeeſt not him that toucheth thee. There are inwardly ſpokẽ to thee certaine ſecret words, which thou art not able to vtter; ſo as that thou cãſt not doubt but that he is neer thee, ye euẽ within thee which doth ſolicit thee, & yet doth not yeeld thee to ſee him as he is.* Which words plainly ſhew, that though a mã ſee not God either cõming or departing, yet he certainly knoweth & perceiueth in himſelfe the work of God. Therefore of the very words which *M.B.* cites *Hier.* ſaith; *that [c] the preſẽce of God cõming to a man is whẽ he becõmeth known to him, & his hiding of himſelf is termed the abſẽce of him as going away;* in neither of which we are able ſufficiẽtly to cõceiue or cõprehẽd him. Wherby we may ſee with how great diſcretiõ this place was broght to proue that gods work in mãs repẽtãce, is not certainly known to him. Now therfore the word of God is warãt to a faithfulmã to aſſure himſelf of his ſaluatiõ. For it biddeth him to [d] *beleeue the Goſpel*, & the goſpel is, that [e] *whoſoeuer beleeueth in Ch. ſhal haue euerlaſting life:* he is therfore to beleeue, that whoſoeuer beleeueth in Chriſt ſhal haue euerlaſting life. He is therfore to beleeue of

a Bernard.

b *Cypr. Proloq de cardinalibus Chriſti operibus. Quomodo fulgur nubes diſrumpit & repentina confuſcatio non tam illuminat quàm hebetat oculum, ita aliquãdo nescio quo motu tangeris & tangi te ſentis, etsi tamen qui te tangit non intueris. Dicuntur tibi quædam verba arcana intrinſecus quæ efferre non ſufficis, vt dubitare non poſſis, quia intra te eſt imò intra te qui te ſolicitat, nec tamen ſicut eſt ſe tibi videndum concedit.*

c Hieron. in Job. cap. 9. Dicit quod veniens Dei preſentia ſit quando homini innoteſcit & quando occultur quaſi abeuntis abſentia indicatur.

d Mar. 1. 15.

e Ioh. 3. 15. 16.

of him ſelfe, that becauſe hee beleeueth in Chriſt hee ſhall haue euerlaſting life. Or if hee doe not beleeue of himſelfe, beleeuing in Chriſt that he ſhall haue euerlaſting life, he beleeueth not the Goſpell, that *whoſoeuer beleeueth in Chriſt ſhall haue euerlaſting life.* And thus the ſtrength of *M. Biſhops* argument is verie feeble, neither is it onely vaine in it ſelfe, but hee hath dealt as abſurdly in the handling of it.

3. W. BISHOP.

*The ſecond is. It is no article of the Creed, that a man muſt beleeue his owne Saluation, and therefore no man is bound thereunto.*

M. Perkins *anſwereth.* That euerie article of the Creed containes this particular faith of our owne Saluation, namely three: Firſt (*ſaith hee*) to beleeue in God, is to beleeue that God is our God, and to put our truſt in him for our Saluation.

Anſwer. *I admit all this, and adde more* (*that* M. Perkins *bee no longer ignorant of the Catholike knowledge of the Creed*) *that wee muſt alſo loue him with all our heart and ſtrength: thou wee vnderſtand it more fully then hee: Yet finde not out that thirteenth article,* Thou muſt beleeue thine owne particular Saluation. *For albeit, I beleeue and truſt in God, yet not beeing ſure of my loue towards him, I am not aſſured of Saluation, for as* S. Iohn *teſtifieth,* Hee that loueth not, abideth in death. 1. Iohn. 3.

*So I anſwer to the ſecond article named by* M. Perkins, *that is, I beleeue that God of his infinite mercy, through the merits of Chriſts paſſion, doth pardon all thoſe, who beeing heartilie ſorie for their ſinnes, do humblie confeſſe them, and fullie purpoſe to leade a new life: that I my ſelfe am ſuch a one, I doe verily hope, becauſe I haue as farre forth as I could, to my knowledge performed thoſe things which God requires of mee, but becauſe I am but a fraile creature, and may perhaps not haue done all that ſo well as I ought, or am not ſo well aſſured of that, which by Gods helpe I haue done, I cannot beleeue it, for in matter of faith (as you ſhall heare ſhortly) there can be no feare or doubt.*

*The like anſwer is giuen to the article of life euerlaſting. I beleeue that I ſhall haue life euerlaſting, if I fulfil that which our Sauiour taught* Mat. 19. *the young man, demanding what hee muſt doe to haue life euerlaſting: to wit, if I keepe all Gods commandements, but becauſe I am not aſſured that I ſhall doe ſo (yea the Proteſtants (though falſly) affirme vs, that no man by any helpe of Gods grace can ſo doe,) I remaine in feare.*

*But (saith* M. Perkins) *the diuell may so beleeue the articicles of the Creed, vnlesse we do apply those articles to our selues. First, I say the diuell knowes to be true all that we do beleeue, and therefore are said by* S. Iames *to beleeue, but they want a necessarie condition of faith, that is a godly and deuout submission of their vnderstanding vnto the obedience of faith, and so haue no faith to speake properly. Againe, they trust not in God for Saluation, nor indeauour not any manner of way to obtaine Saluation, as Christians doe, and so there is great difference betweene their beleefe in the articles of the Creed, and ours.*

R. Abbot.

To this argument *M. Perkins* iustlie saith, that the pillars of the Church of Rome doe not vnderstand the Creed, who hauing corrupted all points of Christian faith, must needes frame the articles of the Creed to the same corruption. Whether they were the Apostles or other after them, that layed together this briefe of faith, they intended not therein a narration of common historie, but a profession of priuat hope. And that may appeare by the phrase wherein they haue expressed this beleefe; I BELEEVE IN GOD THE FATHER; I BELEEVE IN IESVS CHRIST; I BELEEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST. For well doth *M. Perkins* note, that to say, *I beleeue in God*, is all one, as to say, I beleeue that God is my God, and I haue an assured confidence and trust in him to be saued by his mercie. *M. Bishop* mentioneth the answer in superficiall and generall termes, that to beleeue in God is to beleeue that God is our God, and to put our trust in him for our Saluation, and in this sort admitteth it, but to that purpose as *M. Perkins* spake it, hee will by no meanes admit it, because so to admit it, should be to grant the point in question. He can bee content that we in common beleeue God to be *our God* by right of soueraignty and authority, but he will not endure that any man shall say as *M. Perkins* intended, I beleeue that God is *my God*, by affection of loue. He will like well enough that wee put our trust in him for our Saluation, so as to looke to be saued by him if wee bee saued, and haply to carry some probable opinion that we shall bee saued, but in no case will suffer vs to conceiue so of our selues, as to say with the Apostle, * *God hath not appointed vs to wrath, but to obtaine*

* 1. Thes. 5. 9.

Hee doth not truſt in God, that doth not rely wholy vpon Gods mercy, and thereby looke for that at his hands for which hee truſteth in him, ſo as to account himſelfe deceiued by him if he faile thereof, which neuer hath befallen to any, nor ſhall befall that doth put his truſt in God. *M. Biſhop* diuideth this truſt betwixt God and himſelfe, and ſo truſteth in God, as that he maketh that for which he profeſſeth to truſt in God, to hang chiefly vpon himſelfe, and therefore no maruell if he haue no aſſurance of Saluation, becauſe he incurreth rather the curſe denounced by the Prophet, [t] *Curſed is the man that truſteth in man, and maketh fleſh his arme.* For what doth he elſe when he leaueth the whole work of God, as wee haue heard before, to be confirmed and made good by his own *free will?* Now as touching that other article of beleeuing in Chriſt, to haue by his merits remiſſion of ſinnes, *S. Auſtin* teacheth vs, that [u] *to beleeue in Chriſt is to be vnited vnto Chriſt, to be made one with him, to be incorporated, to be members of his body.* He expoundeth it to be all one with that which Chriſt ſaith in the Goſpell, of [x] *eating his fleſh & drinking his bloud*, which whoſoeuer doth, [y] *dwelleth in Chriſt and Chriſt in him, he hath eternall life, and Chriſt will raiſe him vp at the laſt day.* Thus the Goſpell of Chriſt inſtructeth vs, and hee that beleeueth in Chriſt, becauſe he beleeueth the Goſpell, muſt beleeue that he is a member of Chriſt, one with Chriſt and Chriſt with him; that he dwelleth in Chriſt, and Chriſt in him, that Chriſt hath giuen vnto him eternall life, and will raiſe him vp at the laſt day; being aſſured, that as a head wil not ſuffer a member of it owne body to periſh, which it hath in his power to preſerue; ſo Chriſt hauing made him a member of his body, and hauing power to ſaue him, will not ſuffer him to periſh, but as a faithfull Mediatour will performe that charge, which [z] *the will of the heauenly father* hath laid vpon him, *that of all that he hath giuen him he ſhould looſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it vp at the laſt day.* Now *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *he beleeueth that God for the merits of Chriſts paſſion, doth forgiue them that are heartily ſorie for their ſinnes, and humblie confeſſe them, with a full purpoſe of a new life. And this he hopeth that he hath done, but he cannot aſſure himſelf that he hath done it, or that he hath done it ſo well as he ought to do, and therefore cannot beleeue the forgiueneſſe of his ſinnes.* Where we ſee, that the merits of Chriſts paſſion is not ſufficient in his opinion, to purchaſe for him the forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, but it muſt further

t Icrem. 17. 5.

u *Auguſt. in Ioan. tract. 29. & de verb. dom. ſer. 61. Credendo in eum ire & membris eius incorporari.*

x *Quoquo modo vnitur in eum & membrum in corpore eius efficitur.*

x *Idem in Ioan. tract. 26. Credere in Chriſtum, hoc eſt manducare panem viuum.*

y Iohn. 6. 54. 56.

z Iohn. 6. 39.

there hang vpon the ſufficiencie and perfection of his owne repentance. It is not enough that he truelie repent, vnleſſe he repent *ſo well as hee ought to do*, that his repentance may deſerue the pardon that he ſeeketh for. But we for our parts know and confeſſe, that our repentance, our faith, our righteouſneſſe, are neuer ſuch *as they ought to bee*: we are ſhort and vnperfect in the ſorrow for our ſinnes; our purpoſes of newe life and amendment of our defaults, proue often times like [a] *the morning dew* that is quickly dried vp. And therfore it is not the value and woorth of our repentance that we reſt vpon to merite pardon and forgiueneſſe, but wee require a ſinceritie and truth thereof, faithfully to craue the ſame, beeing but as the paine and griefe which maketh to ſeek the medicine whereby it is eaſed; as the hunger and thirſt which maketh to craue the foode whereby it is releeued; as the feeling of beggerie and want, which maketh to ſeeke the treaſure and riches by which it is ſupplied. Which ſupplie and releeſe ſpiritually we find in this, that [b] *we are iuſtified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Chriſt Ieſus, whom God hath ſet foorth to be an atonement for vs* (not by the merit of our repentance) but *by faith in his blond*. [c] *Freelie, for god a mercy, for nothing*, as the Rhemiſts expound the word *gratis*, willing to ſhew a little truth in giuing the right ſignification of the word, but craftilie ſuppreſſing the ſame truth, and plainly contradicting it by a colourable gloſſe deuiſed againſt the text of the Apoſtle, and againſt the ſignification of the word, which force of truth hath wreſted from themſelues. [d] *Freely*, ſaith *Ambroſe, becauſe hauing no workes, nor yeelding any requitall euen of the gift of God, we are iuſtified by faith onely*. [e] *Freely*, ſaith *Chryſoſtome, becauſe he vſeth heereto no workes of ours, but requireth faith onely*. And he requireth *faith only*, onely as a hand whereby wee receiue, not as a worke whereby wee deſerue this forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes, that ſo the true penitent may firmely expect it in Chriſt onely by beleeuing, not hang in ſuſpence of it by beeing in doubt of vnſufficiencie in repenting; God hauing therefore appointed it to be [f] *by faith that it may bee of grace, that the promiſe* (thereof) *may bee ſure* (not in it ſelfe, not with God; who doubteth but in that reſpect it is ſure enough? but) *to all the ſeede*, that is, to euerie one that beleeueth; the promiſe beeing *that* [g] *through the name of Chriſt, euerie one that beleeueth in him ſhall haue forgiueneſſe of ſinnes*. Which faith, though it bee yet but weake and little

[a] Oſe.6.4

[b] Rom 3.24.

[c] *Rhem. Teſtam. Explicat.* of certaine words: in the end.

[d] *Ambr. in Rom. ca. 3. Gratis quia nihil operantes, neque vicem reddentes ſola fide iuſtificati ſunt dono Dei.*

[e] *Chryſ. in Rom. hom. 7. Nullis ad hoc vſus operibus ſed fidem tantum exigens.*

[f] Rom.4.16.

[g] Act.10.43.

little, and ſometimes interrupted with feares and doubts, yet God accepteth it and cheriſheth it, that by more experience it may grow to more ſtrength, neither is it true which *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that in matter of faith there is no feare or doubt, as anon after ſhall appeare. In the meane time he further addeth as touching the article of *Eternall life*, that *he beleeueth he ſhall haue it, if he ſhall keepe all Gods commandements, but becauſe he is not aſſured that he ſhall ſo do, he remaineth in feare.* And very iuſtly may he be in feare that looketh for eternall life vpon no other condition then he doth. The Apoſtle indeed doth plainely debarre him from all hope and expectation thereof, when he ſaith [h] *So many as are of the workes of the law, are vnder the curſe, for it is written, Curſed is euery one that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the law to doe them.* Where he plainely taketh it for graunted, that no man continueth in all things that are written in the law, that is, that no man keepeth all Gods commandements, and therefore concludeth, that he that for eternall life dependeth vpon *keeping all Gods commandements*, cannot auoid the curſe. Yea, but Chriſt ſaith to the young man in the Goſpell, [i] *If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the commandements.* It is true; but Chriſt ſaith it to induce the young man to the knowledge of himſelfe, and very ill is it applied to ſeduce men from the true acknowledgement of the faith of Chriſt. The young man asketh *what he might do to inherit eternall life?* Our Sauiour Chriſt referreth him to the law, as [k] *the Schoolemaſter to traine him vnto Chriſt*, that finding it [l] *a thing impoſſible for the law to giue him life*, and therefore caſting off all vaine confidence of the righteouſneſſe thereof, hee might bee fitted to embrace [m] *the faith of that name, in which onely life* and *Saluation* is offred vnto vs. Which it plainlie appeareth this young man conceiued not, by reaſon of a preſumption that he had by miſunderſtanding the law, that he had obſerued the law. The vaine opinion wherof to diſcouer, our Sauiour biddeth him to ſell all & giue to the poore, promiſing him treaſure in heauen, and willing him in the meane time, to come and follow him, that it might appeare how far he was frō that loue of God & his neighbour which the law required, in whoſe heart the loue of riches bare ſo great a ſway, as that he could not be content at Gods cōmandement vpō promiſe of heauenly treaſure, to beſtow the ſame to the neceſſity of his neighbour. Now if he had rightly eſteemed of himſelfe

h Gal. 3. 10.

i Mat. 19. 17.

k Gal 3. 25.

l Rom. 8. 3. Gal. 3. 21.

m Acts. 4. 12.

himselfe how farre he was from being answerable to the righteousnesse of the law, he would haue profited by the words of Christ, and haue taken occasion thereby to come to Christ for the obtaining of eternall life, the true meanes whereof he directeth when he saith, [u] *This is life eternall, to know thee the onely true God, and Iesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* Which knowledge of Christ seeing this man had not, without which *M. Bishop* himselfe I hope will say there is no eternall life, surely euen by his owne grounds it must be absurd, to say that Christ by these words did simply intend to direct him a way for the obtaining of eternall life. And if he will say, that he was indeed first to beleeue, and then by faith to keepe the commandements, thereby to enter into life, the Apostle taketh exception against that, when citing the words of the Prophet, *The iust shall liue by faith*, he inferreth, [x] *Now the law is not of faith, but saith, Hee that doth these things shall liue in them.* For if the law saying, *He that doth these things, shall liue in them*, do not accord with the faith of Christ, then it is not for them to professe the faith of Christ, *in the doing of these things*, that is, in the keeping of the commandements to expect the obtaining of eternall life. Yea, [p] *the grace of the Gospell is made void if it bring Christ to the law*, saith *Tertullian*, which he learned of the Apostle, saying, [q] *Ye are voided of Christ, ye are fallen from grace that will be iustified by the law.* Therefore he saith: [r] *If they which bee of the law be heires, then faith is made void, and the promise is made of none effect*: [s] *If the inheritance bee by the law, it is no longer by promise.* [t] *But God hath giuen it by promise*, and therfore faith beleeueth [t] *that God hath giuen vnto vs eternall life, and this life is* (not in our keeping the commandements but) *in his sonne*, and in him only we are to expect it, that from the beginning to the end wee may still confesse, that [u] *eternall life is the gift of God through Iesus Christ our Lord.* The commandements of God therefore are now laid before vs, not as the condition for obtaining of eternall life, but as the way to walke in vnto eternall life, assured vnto vs by the free promise and gift of God. And of this promise and gift of God the keeping of Gods commandements is a part, who hath said, [x] *I will put my law in their hearts, and in their minds will I write them*; [y] *I will put my spirit into them, and will cause them to walke in my statutes, and to keep my iudgements and doe them.* Whereto agree the words of the Apostle, [z] *We are his workmanship, created in Christ Iesus vnto good works, which God hath*

u John 17.3.

x Gal. 3.11.

p *Tertull. de præscript. Euacuatur gratia Euangelica si ad legem Christum redigis.*
q Gal. 5.4.
r Rom. 4.14.
s Gal. 3.18.

t 1. Iohn 5.10.11

u Rom. 6.23.

x Ierem. 31.33.
y Ezech. 36.27.

z Ephe. 2.10.

*hath prepared for vs to walke in.* Which *workmanship* when by the grace of God it is begun in vs, albeit by reason of many imperfections it be not such, as that by the vertue thereof we may expect eternall life, yet our faith receiueth further confirmation and assurance thereby, that hee that hath wrought this beginning of life, will goe forward therewith to the end, and hauing made vs partakers of one part of his promise, will make vs also partakers of the other, taking these first fruits of sanctification, as an earnest and pledge from him of the performance of the whole. Therefore albeit wee well know, that we do not keep the cõmandements of God as we ought to doe, yet wee doe not for that cause stand in doubt of eternall life, but finding our hearts truly affected towards God, [a] *hungring and thirsting after righteousnesse,* vnfainedly hating sinne, and groning vnder the burden of it, [b] *hanging so fast on,* we comfort our selues, that God hath made the light of his Saluatiõ to shine vnto vs, resoluing according to his promise, that this Sunne-rising though it bee not yet fully cleere, and may haply sometimes be ouercast with clouds, yet shall neuer haue any night, but that excepting our godly indeauours, pardoning our defects and wants, forgiuing vs all our sinnes, hee will [c] *perfect the good worke which hee hath* so graciously *begun* in vs, so that the true faithfull soule may alwaies boldly say, [d] *Thy louing kindnesse and mercy, shall follow me all the dayes of my life, & I shal dwell in the house of the Lord for euer.* Now because *M. Bishop* laieth no other but a rotten foundation, no maruell if hee build no other but a tottering and shaking house, because hee looketh to haue life grow out of his keeping of the commandements, which is as a reed continually shaken with the wind, no maruell if hee denie to himselfe any stedfast assurance and trust of attaining thereunto. But yet it is a falshood of his to charge the Protestants with affirming, *that no man by any helpe of Gods grace can keep Gods commandements.* The Protestants onely say, that God giueth vs not that fulnesse of grace whilest heere we liue, as that we can fully and perfectly keepe the commandements of God so as to bee iustified thereby, but they deny not, but that all the faithfull according to the degrees and measure of grace receiued, doe in a measure keepe Gods commandements, and as grace is increased, so they increase in the keeping of the commandements, and that this grace shall yet further renew, and sanctifie them, in such sort, as that in the end corruption & sin

[a] Mat. 5. 6.
[b] Heb. 2. 1.
[c] Phil. 1. 6.
[d] Psal. 23. 6.

being

beeing wholly abolished for euer, they shall be fullie conformed to that image of righteousnesse that God hath described in the lawe. But of this heereafter. In the meane time wee see by that that *M. Bishop* hath told vs of faith, that the Church of Rome indeed teacheth no other faith but the same that diuels haue. Which beeing obiected by *M. Perkins*, hee laboureth to cleare, but saith nothing to serue the turne, but by ouerthrowing that which he buildeth otherwhere. He saith, *that the diuels knowe all to be true which wee beleeue, but yet do want a necessarie condition of faith, which is a godly & deuout submission of their vnderstanding to the obedience of faith, and so haue no faith to speake properly.* But if *godly and deuout submission of the vnderstanding to the obedience of faith*, be a *necessarie condition of faith*, as hee telleth vs heere, so as that which is *called faith* without this is not *properlie so called*, how then standeth it which elsewhere he determineth, that faith trulie and properly so called, may be without *charity and good works*? For what *godlinesse*, what *deuotion*, what *submission or obedience* can there be where *charitie* is not? *Godlinesse*, *deuotion*, *submission*, *obedience*, what are they but *good workes*? If then faith properly so called, cannot bee without these, then it is true which wee say, that true faith can neuer bee without charitie and good workes. But that hee denieth in the other place, and with common consent they all denie it. Therefore he must denie that which heere he himselfe saith, that *godly and deuout submission of the vnderstanding to the obedience of faith, is a necessary condition of faith properly so called*, and so, as yet there is no exception but that their faith is the same with the diuels faith. But taking this which he saith, which indeed is true, though he by no meanes must stand to it, that *godly and deuout submission, &c.* is a *necessary condition of true faith*, yet because it is but a condition adioined, and not the verie nature of faith it selfe, surely vnlesse hee describe faith in other sort then hee doth, hee answereth yet nothing as touching the very act of faith, but that the faith of diuels is all one with their faith. His other exception is, that *the diuels trust not in God for Saluation, nor indeauour any manner of way to obtaine it as Christians do.* Which is euen as vaine as the former was, because hee answereth nothing to put difference as touching faith it selfe, he himselfe still denying that *trust in God for a mans owne Saluation*, is any part of faith. But he should haue answered directly to the point, what there is in the very

very nature of faith it ſelfe, whereby their faith is to bee diſtinguiſhed from the faith of diuels, whereof he is not able to giue vs any certaine anſwer. And to be ſhort, all that hee hath here ſaid is but framed for a ſhew, to ſerue for preſent ſhift, becauſe hee dareth not deny but that there hath bin and are many deſperate rakehels (yea of their Popes and Cardinals there haue not wanted ſuch) in whom there is no *godly or deuout ſubmiſſion of vnderſtanding to the obedience of faith, no truſt in God for Salvation, no indeauour to obtaine it*, who yet haue had their Catholike faith, to beleeue that Chriſt hath died, and riſen againe, and that by his bloud there is forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, though not for them, yet for them that repent: ſo that in that which he ſaith hitherto, there is nothing at all whereby to put difference betwixt their faith & the diuels faith, and hereafter we ſhall ſee, that he is able to ſay no more then here he hath ſaid.

## 4. W. Bishop.

M Perkins *in his firſt exception graunts*: That commonly men do not beleeue their Saluation, as infallibly as they doe the articles of the faith (*yet ſaith he*) ſome ſpeciall men do. Pag. 54.

*Whereof I inferre by his owne confeſſion, that our particular Saluation is not to be beleeued by faith, for whatſoeuer we beleeue by faith, is as infallible as the word of God, which aſſureth vs of it. Then if the common ſort of the faithfull do not beleeue their Saluation, to be as infallible as the articles of our Creed, yea as Gods owne word, they are not by faith aſſured of it. Now that ſome ſpeciall good men, either by reuelation from God, or by long exerciſe of a virtuous life, haue a great Certaintie of their Saluation, we willingly confeſſe: but that Certaintie doth rather belong to a well grounded hope, then to an ordinarie faith.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins* rightly ſaith, that the Scriptures in this matter of faith & aſſurance, do direct vs the duty of faith, what it ought to do, and what we are to pray and labour for, though we do not all and alwaies attaine vnto it. Secondly, that though commonly men do not with the like aſſurance beleeue their owne Saluation, as they do the doctrine of faith expreſſed in the articles of the Creed, yet

that ſome ſpeciall men do ſo, as did *Abraham*, and the Prophets, and Apoſtles, and martyrs of God in all ages, who without doubting laied downe their liues for the teſtimony of God, and for the name of Chriſt, aſſuring themſelues to receiue a better reſurrectiō. And ſo we make no queſtion, but that by the ſame ſpirit that certified them, many faithfull alſo now do receiue the like certificate of eternall bliſſe, and are thereby ready if occaſion ſerue to doe the ſame that they haue done. Now becauſe he ſaith that *commonly* men do not ſo infallibly beleeue their owne ſaluation, though ſome *ſpeciall men do, hereof*, ſaith M. Biſhop, *I inferre by his owne confeſſion, that our particular Saluation is not to be beleeued by faith.* But of his confeſſion followeth no ſuch illation. For he cannot conclude, that therfore our own Saluation is not infallibly to be beleeued by faith becauſe men do not cōmonly ſo beleeue it, but rather that it is ſo to be beleeued by faith, becauſe ſome ſpeciall men do beleeue it ſo, for that in thoſe ſpeciall men is example to the reſt, what they ought to ſtriue vnto. But ſaith *M. Biſhop, Whatſoeuer we beleeue by faith, is as infallible as the word of God that aſſureth vs of it.* And we grant that it is as infallible in it ſelfe, but not alwaies ſo in our apprehenſion & feeling. And if he will ſay that it is alwaies as infallible to vs and our vnderſtanding and conſcience, he ſpeaketh very falſly and abſurdlie: for there are diuers degrees of faith, [a] *little faith*, [b] *great faith*, [c] *full aſſurance of faith*; euen as a weake eie and a ſtrong eie. And as a weake eie ſeeth but weakly and vnperfectly, and a ſtrong eie ſeeth ſtrongly and more fully diſcerneth the thing ſeene, ſo a *little faith* beleeueth faintly, though truly, *greater faith* beleeueth more ſtedfaſtly; *full aſſurance* of faith [d] *beleeueth vnder hope euen againſt hope*. The diſciples of Chriſt ſaid vnto him, [e] *We beleeue & know that thou art Chriſt the Sonne of the liuing God.* Which in it ſelfe was infallibly true, and yet they did not ſo infallibly apprehend it, but that this faith was ſoone ſhaken: and becauſe they did not yet infallibly beleeue it, our Sauiour telleth them, that therefore he forewarned them of his death & reſurrection, that [f] *when it was come to paſſe they might beleeue*, namely as *S. Auſtine* ſaith, [g] *that he was Chriſt the Son of the liuing God Which*, as he addeth, *they ſhould not beleeue not with a new faith, but with a faith increaſed, which was quailed in his death, but repaired in his reſurrection. For they were not without this faith before, that he was the Sonne of God, but when it came to paſſe which he fore-*

a Mat. 8. 26.
b Cap. 15. 28.
c Rom. 4. 21.
d Ibid. ver. 18.
e Iohn 6. 69.
f Ibid. ca. 14 29.
g *Auguſt in Ioan. tract. 79. Quo viſo illud fuerant creaturi quòd ipſe eſſet Chriſtus filius Dei viui, &c. Creditur autem hoc nō fide noua ſed auctā, aut certè cū mortuus eſſet defecta, cùm reſurrexiſſet refecta. Neque enim eum Dei filium non & ante credebant. ſed cùm in illo factū eſt quod ante prædixit, fides illa quæ tunc quando ibi loquebatur fuit parua & cùm moreretur penè iam nulla & reuixit vt creſceret.*

*foretold, that faith which when he ſpake vnto them was little and ſmall, and when he died in a manner none, both reuiued and increaſed.* It was faith that made [h] *Peter* vpon Chriſts word to ſtep into the ſea to go to Chriſt vpon the waters, beleeuing that he ſhould be ſafe; but yet he beleeued it not infallibly, & the faintneſſe of his faith made him begin to ſink, ſo that being vehemently afraid, hee cried out vnto Chriſt for help, ſaying *Maſter, ſaue me.* Therfore our ſauior ſaith to him, [i] *O thou of little faith, wherefore didſt thou doubt?* In which ſort when another time the diſciples were afraid, by reaſon of a tempeſt vpon the ſea, & awaked him being aſleepe, ſaying vnto him, [k] *Maſter ſaue vs we periſh*, he anſwered them, *Why are ye feareful, ô ye of little faith?* in both theſe places ſhewing that *little faith*, ſuch as now the faith of the Apoſtles themſelues was, doth not make a man ſo infallibly to beleeue, as that he is therby wholy voided of feare and doubt; yet ſheweth it ſelfe to be true faith, in that the ſame feare & doubt maketh him alwaies to run to Chriſt, as expecting ſuccour & ſtrength in him. Such is the faith wherby the common ſort of faithful men do beleeue their own particular Saluation, truely and effectually to the comfort of their ſoules, yet not ſo fully and infallibly, as to be altogether freed from feare and doubt. For it is to be obſerued, which was intimated before, that matters of faith concerning our own Saluation, doe conſiſt partly in principles deliuered by the word of God, & partly in concluſions thence deriued to our ſelues. Now albeit faith ſometimes do wauer and ſtagger, as touching the very principles themſelues and immediate words of God, yet becauſe the truth & certainty thereof is more eaſily and better conceiued, they are for the moſt part more familiarly & readily beleeued. But the concluſions, becauſe of themſelues they are vnknown and haue their light onely from the principles, are not ſo firmly apprehended as the principles themſelues, whilſt doubts haply may be caſt, leaſt there be any errour committed in the application and vſe thereof. It is a principle deliuered for aſſurance of Saluation; [l] *Beleeue in the Lord Ieſus Chriſt and thou ſhalt be ſaued.* Hereupon the faithful man inferreth to himſelf, I beleeue in the Lord Ieſus Chriſt, therefore I ſhall bee ſaued. In this either confuſely or expreſly inferred, he comforteth himſelf, & reioiceth in God, & in hope hereof cheereſully ſerueth God, calleth vpon his name, & in patience expecteth the reuealing of his Saluation. And yet ſometimes it falleth

h. Mat. 14. 28.

i Verſ. 31.

k Cap. 8. 25.

l Acts 16. 31.

out that he queſtioneth his faith, and not ſeeing ſuch effect thereof as he ſuppoſeth there ought to be, maketh doubt leaſt haply he be deceiued, and though the principle be true by which he firſt beleeued, yet is iealous leaſt he haue miſapplied it to himſelfe. Thus ſomtimes by other temptations true faith is aſſaulted and greatly ſhaken, ſo that he that greatly reioyced in the Saluation of the Lord, by haſty cogitations is ouer taken and brought to ſay as *Dauid* in that caſe did, [m] *I am caſt out of the ſight of thine eies.* This was the manner of the Apoſtles faith at firſt, and this manner of faith and aſſurance do we teach, and do teach men to pray with the Apoſtles, [n] *Lord increaſe our faith,* that from weakneſſe of faith and ſlender aſſurance, we may grow to ſtrength of faith and full aſſurance, as the Apoſtles did. In the meane while therefore it is falſe and contrary to the word of God which *M. Biſhop* ſaith that the faithfull haue not by faith aſſurance of Saluation, vnleſſe they beleeue it to be as infallible as the word of God it ſelfe. Now for concluſion he confeſſeth, *that ſome either by reuelation from God, or by long exerciſe of virtuous life, haue a great Certaintie of Saluation,* but that, he ſaith, *doth rather belong to a well grounded hope, then to an ordinarie faith.* But we anſwere him, that there is no *wel grounded hope,* but that which is grounded vpon *ordinarie faith* and beleefe of that that is hoped for. For hope is the proper effect of ordinary faith, and nothing elſe, as we ſhall ſee heerafter, but a patient expectation of that that we beleeue ſhal be, and if we do not beleeue that it ſhal be, we cannot be ſaid to hope for it in that ſenſe wherein the ſcripture teacheth hope. Of *ordinarie faith* it is that the Apoſtle ſaith: [o] *Being iuſtified by faith, we haue peace towards God through Ieſus Chriſt our Lord, by whom we haue acceſſe through faith vnto this grace wherein we ſtand and reioyce vnder the hope of the glorie of God,* thereby ſhewing, that *to reioyce vnder the hope of the glory of God,* is the effect of an *ordinary faith,* whereby wee are aſſured of peace with God. Of *ordinary faith S. Iohn* ſpeaketh where hee ſaith, [p] *Theſe things haue I written vnto you that beleeue in the name of the Sonne of God, that ye may know that ye haue eternall life.* By *ordinary faith* therefore the faithfull are (not vncertainly to hope, but aſſuredly) *to know, that they haue eternall life.* But it is heere to bee obſerued, that Maiſter *Biſhop* affirmeth not onelie of that Certaintie that is gotten by long exerciſe of vertuous life, but alſo of that that

m Pſal. 31. 22.

n Luk. 17. 5.

o Rom. 5. 1.

p 1. Iohn 5. 13.

is

is *by reuelation from God*, that it rather *belongeth to hope then to ordinarie faith*; writing he wist not what himselfe, because if he bee asked the question, he will not deny, but that whatsoeuer God hath reuealed is to be beleeued by ordinarie faith, because he saith afterwards that it is the Catholike faith, that is, ordinarie faith *to beleeue all that to be true which God hath reuealed*. Howsoeuer the *reuelation* be extraordinarie, as we knowe he intendeth it, yet it is ordinarie faith by which a man beleeueth such extraordinry reuelation, so as that neither that assurance that is had by this extraordinary reuelation, is altogether free from feares and doubts, shaking sometimes the confidence of that which a man hath receiued immediatly from the oracle of Gods owne mouth, or by speciall messengers directed from God for certificate in that behalfe. Which is to bee seene in the examples of *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Dauid* and others, to whom God had giuen speciall promise of his protection and fauour, and yet vpon occasions they haue bewraied great infirmitie in the apprehension thereof. And if this befall to faith in those things that are extraordinarily reuealed, much more we may assure our selues that it befalleth there, where we haue no other but ordinarie reuelation by the written word of God. Therefore on euerie side *M Bishops* assertion is false, that there can be no assurance by faith of our owne Saluation, vnlesse wee beleeue it with the like infallible Certainty, as we do the truth of the word of God.

5. W. Bishop.

*The third reason for the Catholikes, is, that wee are bidden to pray daily for the remission of our sinnes. But that were needlesse, if wee were before assured, both of pardon and Saluation.* Mat. 5.

M. Perkins *answereth*, First, that we pray daily for the remission of new sinnes committed that day. *Be it so. What needs that, if we were before assured of pardon?* Marrie (*saith he*) because our assurance was but weake and small, our praier is to increase our assurance. *Good Sir, do you not see how you ouerthrow your selfe? If your assurance be but weake and small, it is not the assurance of faith, which is as great, and as strong, as the truth of God.*

*Wee giue God thanks for those gifts which wee haue receiued at his bountifull hands, & desire him to increase, or continue them, if they may be lost. But to pray to God to giue vs those things wee are assured of by*

*faith, is as fond and friuolous, as to pray him to make Christ our Lord to be his sonne, or that there may be life euerlasting to his Saints in heauen, of which they are in full and assured possession. And so these three Arguments by* M. perkins *propounded here for vs, are very substantiall and sufficient, to assure euery good Christian, that he may well hope for Saluation doing his dutie, but may not without great presumption, assure him by faith of it.*

R. ABBOT.

The comfort of the faithfull mans praier, is the same assurance that *Dauid* had, [a] *When I call vpon the Lord, hee will heare me*, it being a promise of God to his people, [b] *Call vpon me, and I will heare thee:* in which sort our Sauiour Christ giueth vs incouragement to pray, saying, [c] *What soeuer ye aske in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Sonne.* Therefore *S. Iohn* saith, [d] *This is the assurance that we haue of him, that what soeuer we aske according to his will he heareth vs, and if we know that he heareth vs, we know that we haue the petitions that wee aske of him.* Being therefore bidden to pray for the forgiuenesse of sinnes, and hauing the promise of God, [e] *I will be mercifull vnto them, and their sinnes and iniquities will I remember no more*, we beleeue and by faith stand assured, that when we do pray to haue our sinnes forgiuen vs, God heareth vs and giueth vs pardon and forgiuenesse thereof. We doe not then teach at randon the assurance of the forgiuenesse of sinnes, but in such tenure and forme as we are directed by the word of God, according to which S. *Austine* saith of himselfe, [f] *By the grace of God I am freed, I know, that I enter not into temptation, and that I am heard saying with my fellowes, Forgiue vs our trespasses.* [g] *For this* therefore, that is, [h] *for forgiuenesse of sinnes, shall euery one that is godly,* saith Dauid, *make his praier vnto thee in a time when thou maist be found,* so being assured that *in the great water flouds they shall not come nigh him.* Our faith then assureth vs not of forgiuenesse of sinnes without praier, but that God forgiueth vs when we pray; so that his obiection being framed to our doctrine aright, is as if he should say, Seeing faith assureth vs of forgiuenesse of sinnes when we craue it of him by prayer, what need wee pray? Which was one of *Wrights* drunken reasons, whereby hee would haue laied an absurditie vpon our Church, being himselfe an absurd

*blind.*

a Psal. 4. 3.
b 50. 15.
c Iohn 14. 13.
d 1. Iohn 5. 14.
e Ierem. 31. 34.
f *Augustin. cont. Iulian. Pelag. lib. 6. ca. 5. Quo gratia liberor, vt scio, me intrem intentatione, &c. atque vt exaudiar cum cõfortibus meis, dicens, Dimitte nobis, &c.*
g Psa. 32. 6.
h *Augustin. in Psal. 31. Pro hac: propter hanc vtique peccatorum.*

*blind-asinus*, and not vnderstanding what wee say. But to make the matter more plaine, it is to bee noted, that in three respects we continue daily to aske of God forgiuenes of sinnes, of which *M. Perkins* hath noted two. First, as *S. Austine* saith, [1] *because we daily commit offence, wee haue neede daily to craue pardon.* But *what needs that* saith *M. Bishop*, if wee were before assured of pardon? I haue answered him, that our assurance before hand and alwaies is, that our praier obtaineth it at Gods hands. Therefore wee pray, and by faith doe rest assured, that vndoubtly we haue that for which wee pray. Secondly, we pray for forgiuenesse, not for that we haue no assurance thereof, but for that wee desire greater assurance and more comfortable feeling of it, that as forgiuenesse with God is full and perfect, so the same may accordingly bee sealed in our hearts. Our faith being weake giueth but weake assurance, and therefore we begge of God that our hearts may be enlarged, that [k] *the testimony of the spirit* may more freely sound vnto vs, *Thy sinnes are forgiuen thee.* Now here saith *M. Bishop: Good Sir, do you not see how you ouer throw your selfe?* And why so? Forsooth *if your assurance be but weake & small, it is not the assurance of faith, which is as great and strong as the truth of God.* But good Sir, we haue already shewed you, that therein you tell vs a senselesse and vnlikely tale. The truth of God is alwaies alike, not subiect to alteration, neuer increased or diminished; but our faith is greater and lesse, sometimes hath a full and sometimes a wane, and to vs the truth of God is according to our faith, and according to our apprehension and feeling of it. Wherein we are variable and diuers, euen after the manner of *Peters* faith, of whom *S. Austine* saith: [l] *Peter was the patterne of vs all; sometimes he beleeueth, sometimes he wauereth; one while he confesseth Christ to be immortall, an other while he is afraid lest Christ should die.* The poore distressed man saith in the Gospel, [m] *Lord I beleeue, helpe my vnbeliefe.* [n] *He saith, I beleeue; therefore there is faith,* saith Austine: *helpe my vnbeliefe, saith hee; therefore there is not yet full and perfect faith.* If there be true faith, and yet with faith a remainder of vnbeliefe, then the assurance of faith cannot bee said to be as great and strong as the truth of God; yea the vntruth heereof is so palpable and grosse, and contrary to the common experience of all beleeuers, as that we may iustly maruell at the wilfull absurditie of this man in the assertion of it.

1 *Augustin. de verâ & falsâ pœnit. ca. 5. Quia quotidiana est offensio oportet vt sit quotidiana etiam remissio*

k *Bernard. in Annunciat. ser. 1. supra sect. 3.*

l *Augustin de ver. Dom. ser. 13. Illum videte Petrum qui tunc erat figura vestra, modo fidit, modo titubat; modo immortalem confitetur modo timet mortalem.*

m *Mar. 9.*

n *Augustin. de verb. Dom. ser. 36 Credo inquit, ergò est fides. Sed addimus incredulitatem meam, ergò non est plena fides.*

The third reason of our praying continually for forgiuenesse of sinnes, is for the obtaining of the fruit & effect thereof. For so long as we o *walke by faith and not by sight*, we stil pray for the sight of that as touching which we haue now but the comfort of faith & hope. We beleeue that we are redeemed both in body and soule, yet still we p *sigh in our selues, waiting for the adoption euen the redemption of our bodies.* q *Ioy that thou art redeemed*, saith Austine, *but not yet in reall effect; in hope, or as touching hope, be without all doubt. If thou shalt not now grone in hope, thou shalt not attaine to the reall effect.* Thus then by praier we sigh and groane for our redemption, who yet by faith beleeue that already we are redeemed. So therefore albeit wee beleeue that God hath forgiuen vs our sinnes, yet still wee pray for forgiuenesse of sinnes, that that may appeare to vs which we now beleeeue. The Prophet *Dauid* giueth vs to vnderstand, that r *forgiuenesse of sinnes is blisse and happinesse*, and therefore a freedome from all misery and sorrow. We still liue in misery and sorrow, and seeme wholly strangers to all title of blissefull state. Therefore being still in case as if our sinnes were not forgiuen vs, we stil pray for forgiuenesse of sinnes, that *as we haue heard so we may see*, and by effects may discerne and enioy the same forgiuenesse. But here *M. Bishop* telleth vs, that *to pray to God to giue vs those things we are assured of by faith, is as fond and friuolous, as to pray him to make Christ our Lord to be his Sonne, or that there may bee life euerlasting to his Saints in heauen, of which they are in full and assured possession.* Which is so fond and friuolous a speech, as that well wee may perswade our selues that it neuer came from any wise man. For matters of faith are of diuers sorts. Some are already fully acted and done, and those we onely beleeue, we doe not pray for them, as the creation of the world, the birth, and death, and resurrection of Christ, and other such like. Other some are beleeued, as designed and pronounced by God, but not yet fully acted and effected to vs, which we so beleeue, as that still we pray for them till they bee effected, praier being nothing else but s *the streame or riuer of faith*, & an issue of the desire of that which ioyfully we beleeue. A notable example whereof we see in *Dauid*, who when God had sent *Nathan* to him, to certifie him that he would stablish the kingdom for euer in his house & posterity, albeit he beleeued & ioyfully accepted the tidings hereof, yet forbeareth not therfore to pray that it might be so

o 2. Cor. 5. 7.

p Rom. 8. 23.

q *Augustin. in Psal. 37. Gaude te redemptum, sed nondum re: spe securus esto. Etenim si non gemueris in spe, non peruenies ad rem.*

r Psal. 32. 1.

s *Augustin. de verb. Dom. ser. 26. Ostendit fidem fontem esse orationis, nec posse iri uium eam exire aque siccatur.*

t *Now*

[c] *Now therefore, saith he, confirme for euer the word that thou hast spoken concerning thy seruant and his house, and do as thou hast said. For thou O Lord of hosts hast reuealed vnto thy seruant, saying, I will build thee an house; therefore hath thy seruant beene bold to pray this praier vnto thee. Therefore now let it please thee to blesse the house of thy seruant, that it may continue for euer before thee; for thou O Lord God hast spoken it.* Where wee plainely see him praying vnto God, that that might bee, whereof hee was assured by faith, vpon the promise of God that so it should bee, and not onely so, but did therefore pray, because God had reuealed vnto him that it should be so. And doe wee not thinke that *Dauid* beleeued the word spoken to him from God by the same Prophet, when hee had admonished him of his grieuous trespasse, and he repented, [a] *The Lord hath taken away thy sinne*; and yet afterwards hee praieth, [x] *Haue mercy vpon me, O God, after thy great goodnesse, according to the multitude of thy mercies doe away mine offences.* Our Sauiour Christ beleeued that his [y] *sheepe shall neuer perish*, and therefore that the Father would keepe them, and none should take them out of his hands, and yet hee praieth, [z] *Holy Father keepe them in thy name, euen them whom thou hast giuen mee.* Hee was assured by faith that God would deliuer him from death, [a] *that hee would not leaue his soule in hell, nor suffer his holy one to see corruption*; yet [b] *in the daies of his flesh did offer vp supplications with strong crying and teares to him that was able to saue him from death, and was also heard in that which hee feared.* Hee was assured by faith that God would glorifie him; yet he praieth; [c] *Now glorifie me O Father with thine owne selfe.* The Apostle *S. Paul* was assured by faith, that [d] *the Lord would deliuer him from euery euill worke, and preserue him vnto his heauenly kingdome*; yet hee ceased not to pray, *Leade vs not into temptation, but deliuer vs from euill.* Wee beleeue by faith, and are assured that Christs kingdome shall come; yet we daily pray, *Let thy kingdome come.* Thus therefore albeit by faith in the promise of God, wee now rest assured of the remission of sinnes, yet because it is not yet reuealed, wee still pray, *Forgiue vs our trespasses*, that wee may enioy by reality and possession, what wee beleeue wee already haue in Gods affection. Now albeit these three arguments hitherto beeidle and vaine conceits, yet for conclusion he commendeth them for *substantiall and sufficient, to assure euerie good Christian that hee well may hope for Saluation*

[c] 2. Sam. 7. 25.

[a] 2. Sam. 12. 13. [x] Psal. 51. 1.

[y] Ioh. 10. 28.

[z] Cap. 17. 11.

[a] Psal. 16. 10.

[b] Heb. 5. 7.

[c] Ioh. 17. 5.

[d] 2. Tim. 4. 18.

doing

*doing his dutie, but may not without great presumption assure him of it by faith.* But it hath beene alreadie shewed, that *doing of dutie* can yeeld vs neither faith nor hope truely so called, because wee come so short of the doing of it. Therefore *Hierome* rightly saith, that [e] *if wee consider our owne merits, wee must needs despaire.* But God would haue [f] *the promise to bee sure, not according to our merits, but according to his mercie.* Hee would haue it to depend vpon his *promise* and his *oath,* [g] *that by two immutable things wherein it was impossible that God should lie, wee might haue strong consolation,* which can be but very weake, yea none at all, so long as wee hang it vpon any other thing. It is therefore a wicked presumption to hope for Saluation by vertue of our owne doings, but the presumption that groweth of faith, is a commendable presumption. [h] *It is a good presumption,* saith *Ambrose, to presume, not vpon thine owne worke, but vpon the grace of Christ.* Such a presumption *S. Austine* teacheth. [i] *Whatsoeuer there is about thee, or in thee to presume of, cast it from thee, and let God bee thy whole presumption, or presume wholly vpon God.* Namely in that sort as *S. Ambrose* teacheth by occasion of *Dauids* words, [k] *Receiue mee according to thy word.* [l] *It were a matter of intollerable presumption,* saith he, *to say to God, Receiue me, but that hee addeth the promise of God, as if hee should say, Thou hast caused vs to presume, we challenge thee vpon thine owne bond.* This is the presumption of true faith, whereby wee withdraw our eies from our selues, and cast them wholly vpon God, assuredly beleeuing that wee shall receiue, because wee beleeue in him that promiseth. Therefore *Gregorie* saith, [m] *By presuming of grace and life, the righteous sing of that iudgement which all the vnrighteous are afraid of.* Let *M. Bishop* then learne, that there is a godly presumption of Saluation and eternall life, which because it cannot arise of any sufficiencie of our workes, must necessarilie bee grounded vpon faith alone. Wherein notwithstanding faith receiueth comfort and strength by the good fruits and effects of grace, in the feare and loue of God, in faithfull care and conscience of duty towards God and men, because albeit of themselues they cannot be presumed of, yet being fruits of faith, euen in their beginnings & imperfections, are [n] *tokens of Gods secret election, foretokens of future happinesse,* so that

[e] Hieron. in Esa. l. 17. cap. 64. Si consideremus merita nostra desperandi est.
[f] August. in Psal. 88. Non secundum merita nostra, sed secundum illius misericordiam firma est promissio.
[g] Heb. 6. 18.
[h] Ambros. de Sacrament. li. 5. ca. 4. Presume non de operatione tua, sed de Christi gratia, &c. Bona presumptio.
[i] Aug. in Psal. 85. Quicquid est circa te vel in te vnde possis presumere, abijce à te, & tota presumptio tua Deus sit.
[k] Psal. 119. 116.
[l] Ambr. in Psal. 118. Ser. 15. Intolerandæ presumptionis videretur Deo dicere, suscipe me, nisi promissum eius adiungeres, hoc est, vt auderemus ipse fecisti, tuo te chirographo conuenimus.
[m] Greg. Magn. in Exec. hom. 32. Per presumptionem gratiæ & vitæ tunc aut iusti iudicium quod iniusti omnes pertimescit.
[n] Bern. de grat. & lib. arbit. Occulta prædestinationis indicia, futuræ felicitatis præsagia.

that a man *called to God by feare, and framed to rtghteousnes by loue, presumeth that he is of the number of them that shall be blessed.* M. Bishop is not acquainted with true faith, and professeth that he knoweth not whether he haue any feare or loue of God, and therefore no maruell that he is a stranger to this presumption, and doe take that to be an vnlawfull presumption, which indeed is nothing but true faith.

o Idem epist. 107 *Vocatus quisque per timorem, iustificatus per amorem, praesumit se quoque esse de numero beatorum.*

## 6. W. BISHOP.

*To these I will adde two or three others, which* M. Perkins *afterwards seeks to salue by his exceptions, as he termes them. To his first exception I haue answered before. The second I will put last for orders sake, and answer to the third first, which is:*

The Catholikes say, we are indeed to beleeue our Saluation on Gods part, who is desirous of all mens Saluation, very rich in mercie, and able to saue vs, but our feare riseth in regard of our selues, because the promises of remission of sins depend vpon our true repentãce: *Vnlesse you do penance ye shall al perish.* And the promise of Saluation, is made vpon condition of keeping Gods commandements. *If thou wilt enter into life keepe the Commandements. Againe,* No man shall be crowned, except he combat lawfully. Now we not knowing whether we shall well performe these things required by God at our hands, haue iust cause to feare lest God doe not on his part, performe that which he promiseth vpon such conditions. *To this* M. Perkins *answereth,* That for faith and true repentance, euery man that hath them knoweth well that he hath them. *To which I reply, that for faith being rightly taken, it may be knowne of the party that hath it, because it is a light of the vnderstanding, and so being like a lampe, may bee easily seene: but true repentance requires besides faith, both hope and charitie, which are seated in the darke corners of the will, and cannot by faith be seene in themselues, but are knowne by their effects: which being also vncertaine, doe make but coniectures and a probable opinion, so that place of* S. Paul *may be omitted where hee saith:* Proue your selues whether you be in faith or no. *Because we accord that it may be tried by vs, whether we haue faith or no: although I know well, that Saint* Pauls *words carry a farre different sence. But let that passe as impertinent. To the the other.* That we haue receiued the.

pag. 56.

Luc. 13.

Mat. 19.

2. Tim. 2.

2. Cor. 13.

1. Cor. 2. 12.

the ſpirit which is of God, that we might know the things which are giuen of God. *What things these are which the ſpirit reuealeth to vs*, S. Paul *teacheth in the ſame place*, That which the eye hath not ſeene nor eare hath heard, &c. God hath prepared for them, that loue him: but to vs God hath reuealed by his ſpirit: *All this is true; but who they be that ſhall attaine to that bleſſed Banquet by God ſo prepared, God onely knoweth, and by his ſpirit reuealeth it to very few. And will you learne out of* S. Ieromc *that ancient Doctor the cauſe why*: Therefore (*ſaith he*) it is put ambiguous and left vncertaine, that while men are doubtfull of their Saluation, they may do pennance more manfully, and ſo may moue God to take compaſſion on them.

In 3 capat. Ion.

## R. Abbot.

The condition of repentance is required, not as whereby wee worke our Saluation, but whereby we ſeeke it, and that not by the keeping of the commandements, wherein we all faile, but in Chriſt alone by faith in him, whence followeth a meaſure of keeping Gods Commandements, and of ſtriuing lawfully vnto him, not as any proper cauſe of Saluation, but as parts and tokens and preparations of and to that Saluation which wee receiue and haue by Chriſt alone. Now heere *M. Perkins* bringeth in the Popiſh Doctors, affirming that wee cannot *be aſſured that wee haue true faith and repentance, becauſe wee may lie in ſecret ſinnes, and ſo want that which we ſuppoſe our ſelues to haue*. *M. Perkins* anſwereth, that hee that doth truly repent and beleeue, knoweth that hee doth ſo. To this *M. Biſhop* replieth, that *faith being rightly taken, may be knowne of the party that hath it, but true repentance cannot*. But how muſt we conceiue of faith when it is *rightly taken*? Forſooth hee telleth vs that it is *a light of vnderſtanding, and ſo being like a lampe may bee eaſily ſeene*. But true faith is not only a matter of vnderſtanding, but a mixt action of the vnderſtanding and will, and conſiſteth not onely in knowing, but in ſeeking, and deſiring, and embracing the thing that wee vnderſtand. Therefore *Oecumenius* obſerueth, that the faith recommended by *S. Paul beſide ſtedfaſt aſſent*, importeth [a] *a further matter proceeding out of the affection*. So wee ſaw before that *Bernard* maketh it to be ſuch as whereby a man beleeueth

a Oecumen. in epiſt. Iac. cap. 2. Conſecutionem ex affectu procedentem cum firmo aſſenſu in nomine fidei vocamus.

ueth that his sinnes are forgiuen him. Which *M. Bishop* might haue learned also of *Ferus* one of their owne Prophets, though a more faithfull Prophet then commonly theirs are, who saith, that b *to beleeue is to trust that God for Christ sake wil not impute our sinnes.* But that we may see the spirit of giddinesse wherewith this man is carried vp and downe, he himselfe but a little before hath told vs, that *godly and deuout submission of the vnderstanding to the obedience of faith, is a necessary condition of faith properly so called* Faith then is not only *a light of vnderstanding*, but implieth godlinesse, deuotion, and submitting of the vnderstanding to the obedience of faith, which because it cannot bee without repentance, hope and charitie, it necessarily followeth, that if a man knoweth that hee hath faith, he knoweth also that he hath godlinesse, deuotion, obedience, repentance, hope, charity, and so *M. Bishops* reply cuen by himselfe is vtterly ouerthrowne. And to this purpose *S. Austin* telleth vs, that c *a man cannot beleeue in Christ without hope and loue*, and *S. Bernard*, that d *the separation of charitie is the death of faith*; and *Origen*, that e *hope cleaueth inseparably vnto faith.* Then if a man know that he hath faith, he cannot bee ignorant that he hath also hope and charity, without which there is no true faith. It is therefore a meere fiction of *M. Bishop*, that a man may know that he hath faith, but he cannot know that hee hath true repentance, because repentance requireth hope and charity, which forsooth are seated in the *darke corners of the will*, and cannot certainely be discerned. What a fond toy is this, that a man hopeth, and knoweth not that he hopeth: that he repenteth, and knoweth not that he repenteth: that he loueth, and knoweth not that he loueth? Surely where these things are, they are knowne: and if they be not known, it is because they are not. For f *the spirit of man knoweth the things that are in man*; hee discerneth what is in himselfe, though not alwayes the measure and quantity thereof. Otherwise how doth *S. Iohn* say: g *By this wee know that wee are translated from death to life, because we loue the brethren*? How shall we know that we are translated from death to life, because we loue the brethren, if we cannot know that we loue the brethren? h *Let a man looke into his heart, and see if he haue charitie, and then let him say, I am borne of God*, saith *S. Austin*, but to what end, if a man cannot see and know whether he haue charitie or not? The same *S. Austin* saith;

b *Ferus in Mat. cap. 27. Credere est confidere Deū per Christum peccata non imputaturum.*

c *Augustin. de verb. Dom. ser. 61. Quis fidem habet sine spe & dilectione Christum esse credit, non in Christū credit.*

d *Bernard in Cāt. serm. 24. Mors fidei separatio est charitatis.*

e *Origen in Ro. ca. 4. Scientes fides spē inseparabiliter coherere.*

f *2. Cor. 2. 11.*

g *1. Ioh. 3. 14.*

h *August. in Ioan epist. tract. 5. Attendat in conscientiam suam si habeat charitatem, & sic dicat natum se ex Deo.*

saith: [i] *If a man haue not the spirit of Christ, let him not deceiue himselfe, he is none of Christs. Behold,* saith he, *by the helpe of Gods mercie we haue the spirit of Christ. By the loue of righteousnesse and true faith, the Catholike faith, we know that there is in vs the spirit of God.* How shall we know by the *loue of righteousnesse* that the spirit of God is in vs, if we cannot know that there is in vs *the loue of righteousnes?* But to infringe that idle deuice, *M. Perkins* alledgeth the words of *S Paul,* [k] *Proue your selues whether you are in the faith.* For to what end is this spoken, if we cannot know whether we are in the faith or not? But *M. Bishop* saith, that *they accord that it may be tried whether a man haue faith or not,* importing therefore that the place is nothing against them. But he may not so auoid it; for the *being in the faith* whereof the Apostle speaketh, signifieth more then hee intendeth thereby. Which appeareth plainely by the words which the Apostle addeth: *Know ye not that Christ is in you, except ye bee reprobates?* thereby shewing that to *proue a mans selfe whether hee bee in the faith,* is to proue whether Christ bee in him, because the *faith* of which hee speaketh is that [l] *liuely faith, whereby Christ dwelleth in our hearts.* And [m] *if Christ be in you,* saith the same Apostle, *the body is dead as touching sinne, but the spirit is life for righteousnesse sake,* which cannot bee without repentance, hope, charity, and such other vertues wherewith the spirit of Christ endueth them in whom Christ doth dwell. Hee therefore that knoweth himselfe to be in the faith, as the Apostle meaneth it, knoweth Christ to bee in himselfe; hee knoweth himselfe to bee dead to sinne, and aliue to righteousnesse, and that he is not without repentance, hope, charitie, and other vertues wrought in him by the spirit of Christ. As for that other meaning of the place which *M. Bishop* speaketh of, if hee had set it downe, I doubt not but we should haue taken him tardie therein, as well as we do in all the rest. To the other place of the same Apostle, that *we haue receiued, not the spirit of this world, but the spirit which is in God, that we may know the things that are giuen vnto vs of God,* he answereth, that the Apostle meaneth it of those things whereof he there speaketh, *The things which neither eye hath seene, nor eare hath heard, &c. God hath prepared for them that loue him, &c. but who shall attaine to that blessed banquet,* saith he, *by God so prepared God onely knoweth, and reuealeth it by his spirit to very*

i *De ver. Apost. ser. 6 Si quis spiritum Christi non habet, non se fallat hic non est eius. Et ce adiuuante ipsius misericordia, spiritum Christi habemus, ex ipsa dilectione iustitiæ, integra fide, catholica fide, spiritum Dei nobis inesse cognoscimus.*

k 2. Cor. 13. 5.

l Bernard. in octauas Pasch. ser. 1. Ea commendatur fides per quam Christus in cordibus nostris habitat.

m Rom. 8. 10.

1. Cor. 2 12.

*very few.* Which answer of his giueth him no euasion at all. For if we do vnderstand the words concerning the ioyes of heauen, and that blessed banquet of which hee speaketh, the Apostles words must import, that we know the same [o] to be giuen vnto vs. For how shall we be said to *know the things that are giuen vnto vs of God*, if we do not know that they are giuen vnto vs? Neither may wee conceiue it as he doth, to know that such things are prepared for the faithfull and righteous; for that the diuels themselues also know. *Balaam* a wicked castaway knew so much when he said, [n] *Let my soule die the death of the righteous, and let my latter end be like vnto his.* *Saul* knew so much, when [o] *he prophecied*, as the [p] *Iewes say, of the world to come, of the rewards of the iust, and punishments of the vniust.* We haue therefore receiued the spirit of God, that wee may know not onely that such things are prepared of God, but that *we may know that* God hath giuen the same vnto vs. But the Apostle there meaneth not onely the ioyes and blisse of heauen, but all the gifts of God, whereby the same are wrought and effected vnto vs. The originall of all which gifts is the giuing of Christ vnto vs, whereof the Prophet speaketh, [q] *Vnto vs a child is borne, and vnto vs a sonne is giuen*, in whom [r] *all the promises of God are yea, and are in him Amen*, for his sake first made, and in him performed; whom the Father giuing to vs and *for vs*, [s] *hath together with him giuen vs all things, the gift of* [t] *the spirit, the gift of* [u] *repentance, the gift of* [x] *faith, the gift of* [y] *righteousnesse, the gift* [z] *of loue, the gift of* [a] *suffering for Christ, the gift of* [b] *all things pertaining to life and godlinesse, the gift of* [c] *eternall life.* All these things *Oecumenius* compriseth when he expounded the *things which eye hath not seene, &c.* to bee [d] *Christ and the Saluation which is wrought by his incarnation*, euen as *Chrysostom* doth vnderstand the same of [e] *the surprising of the world by the foolishnes of preaching* (as the world accounteth it) of *the conuersion of the Gentiles, of the reconciliation of God to men, and the great benefits that should come therby*, euen as the Apostle saith, [f] *all maner spirituall blessings in heauenly things.* In a word we are to vnderstand in the Apostles words, [g] *the vnsearchable riches of Christ preached vnto the Gentils, a mystery which from the beginning of the world was hid in God, & not opened to the sons of men*, eie had not seene it, neither had mans hart conceiued it nay; to the very [h] Angels, *principalities and powers*, it was not known, so that when it was done, [i] *they did euen desire* and delight

n Numb.23.10.
o 1.Sam.10.10.
p Hieron. tradit Hebraic. in lib. Regum. Prophetasse eum ili Iudæi dicunt de futuro seculo, de Gog & Magog, & de præmijs iustorũ & pœna impiorũ.
q Esa.9.6.
r 2.Cor.1.20.
s Rom.8.32.
t 1.John 4.13.
u Act.5.31.
x.Eph.2.8.
y Rom.5 17.
z 2.Tim.1.7.
a Phil.1.29.
b 2.Pet.1.3.
c Rom.6.23.
d Oecumen in. 1.Cor. 2. Quæ præparauit Deus? &c. Christum videlicet & salutem quæ per incarnationem facta est.
e Chrys. in Cor.1. hom.7. Quoniam per eam, quæ videtur esse stultitia prædicationis orbem terræ superabit, & gentes alicientur, et Dei ad homines erit reconciliatio & tanta nobis accedent bona.
f Eph.1.3.
g Cap.3.5.8.9.
h Verse 10.
i 1.Pet.1.12.

delight *to looke into it*. The accomplishment of which riches is the glorie & ioy of heauen, which yet we know not nor can conceiue, as the Apostle S. *Iohn* saith, [k] *Now are wee the sonnes of God, but yet we knowe not what we shall be*, we know not the glory and happinesse that he hath prepared for vs; for we are [l] *now dead, and our life is hidden with Christ in God, but when Christ which is our life shall appeare, then shall we also appeare with him in glory; for we know that when hee shall appeare wee shall bee like vnto him, for wee shall see him as he is.* In the mean time the Apostle saith, that *by the spirit we know the things that are* (alreadie) *giuen vs of God*, not by speculation onely of vnderstanding, but by practicke, and experimentall, and effectuall knowledge, [m] *whereby we are made partakers of the diuine nature*, and [n] *renewed to the image of him who first created vs.* These things therefore we know in our selues, when wee know the things that are giuen vs of God, and consequently doe know our faith, repentance, hope, loue, in which consisteth that newnesse and communion with God. As for the blisse and glory of heauen, though yet we know it not, yet we know that God hath giuen vnto vs the interest and title of it already, and by faith doe stand assured through the spirit, that he will in due time giue vs the full sight and fruition of it. Which indeed none can know but they that haue it reuealed vnto them from God, but God reuealeth it by the spirit in his word to all those that doe beleeue in him. As for the place of *Ierome* which *M. Bishop* alledgeth to the contrary, it sheweth his wretched vnfaithfulnesse, but maketh nothing against vs. *Ionas* had preached destruction to Niniue within fortie daies. The King of Niniue calleth his people to repentance, to sackcloth and ashes, to fasting and mourning, and crying mightily vnto God; for [o] *who knoweth*, saith he, *if God will turne and repent and turne away from his fierce wrath?* thereby signifying, that albeit God had by peremptorie sentence threatned their destruction, yet by repentance and earnest intreaty they might happily find mercy. Hereupon *Hierome* saith, [p] *That that is said, Who knoweth if God will turne, is therefore set downe vncertaine and doubtfull, that whilest men are doubtfull of their safetie, they may the more earnestly repent, and the rather moue God to take mercie on them.* Now what a reason is this, that because God threatning destruction to wicked and vngodly men, leaueth it in doubt whether he will spare them, that they may the more earnestly

k 1. Iohn. 3. 2.

l Col. 3. 3. 4.

m 2. Per. 1. 3. 4.

n Col. 3. 10.

o Ionas 3. 9.

p *Hieron in Ion. cap. 3. Illud quod dicitur, Quis scit, &c ideo ambiguè ponitur & incertum, vt dum homines dubij sunt de salute fortiùs agãt pœnitentiã & magis ad misericordiam prouocent Deum.*

earneſtly repent and call for mercy, therefore the faithfull and godly man whome God hath deliuerrd from euerlaſting deſtruction, and called to the hope of euerlaſting life, ſhould ſtand in doubt of that Saluation that God hath promiſed vnto him? The very place and occaſion of the ſpeech might haue made *M. Biſhop* to forbeare to vſe the ſame to that purpoſe that hee hath done; but that he is ſtill like his maſter *Bellarmine*; ſo that it carrie ſome ſhew, it neuer skilleth whether it be right or wrong.

## 7. W. Bishop.

*Another reaſon of this vncertaintie, yeeldeth Saint* Auguſtine *in theſe wordes*: In this place of temptation, ſuch is our infirmitie, that aſſurednes might engender pride. *To this agreeth S.* Gregorie, *ſaying*: If we know our ſelues to haue grace, we are proud. *So that to ſtrike downe the pride of our hearts, and to humble vs, and to make vs trauaile more carefully in the workes of mortification, God doth not ordinarily aſſure men at the firſt of their owne Saluation: but to cheere vp their hearts on the other ſide, doth put them in great hope of it, like to a diſcreet and good Lord, who will not at the firſt entrance into his ſeruice, infeofe his ſeruant in the fee ſimple of thoſe lands, which after vpon his good deſerts he meaneth to beſtow on him. This is a nother kinde of Doctrine, then that which* M. Perkins *in his laſt ſupply deliuered, to wit*: That if wee regard our owne indiſpoſition, wee muſt deſpaire, becauſe wee bee not worthy of his mercy. *Not ſo good Sir: Becauſe wee know that hee beſtoweth mercy vpon the vnworthy, at the firſt iuſtification of a ſinner, but will not admit into the Kingdome of heauen any vnworthy, but giues men grace while they liue to worke, that they are made worthy of his heauenly Kingdome, according to that*: They ſhall walke with me in whites, becauſe they are worthy, *but of this more fully in the chapter of Merits.*

De cor & gra. cap. 13.

Lib. 9, moral. ca. 17

Apoc. 3. 4.

## R. Abbot.

The place of *Auſtine* is true, as touching immediate and perfect aſſurance, ſuch as is free from all aſſault and impeachment of doubt and feare. For this is a place of temptation and weakneſſe,

as he truly ſaith, by reaſon whereof as wee neuer attaine to a perfection of righteouſneſſe againſt ſinne, ſo wee neuer attaine to a perfection of aſſurance againſt doubting. But yet as wee haue a meaſure of true righteouſneſſe againſt ſinne, wherein we doubt not but God accepteth vs, ſo haue wee alſo a meaſure of true and comfortable aſſurance againſt all feare and doubt, whereby our hearts doe reſt perſwaded, that God for euer will preſerue vs. Thus God as a wiſe and carefull father both giueth comfort to his children, and yet prouideth to keepe them within their bounds, that taſting the ioy of his Saluation, and finding it thenceforth bitter and greeuous vnto themſelues to bee diſtracted by perplexities and feares from the quiet enioying thereof, they may the more carefully endeauour to cleaue faſt vnto him, and beware of doing any thing that ſhould interrupt their ioyfull peace. He knoweth how ready we are by the corruption of our nature to abuſe the comforts and aſſurances that he giueth vnto vs, and therefore ſo ordereth the ſame, as that ſometimes out of our nature, ſometimes by other afflictions they are nipped and sneaped, that they growe not proud and ranke to the decaying and deſtroying of themſelues. And as ſometimes by his admirable wiſdome he maketh ſin the wheſtone of righteouſneſſe, ſo by affliction & trouble of mind, by diſtruſts and fearefull doubts, he whetteth and ſharpeneth our faith and aſſurance, which by fighting increaſeth, and the longer it wraſtleth the ſtronger it waxeth whileſt [a] *faith* (ſpecially when it is aſſaulted) *powreth foorth praier, and powring forth of praier obtaineth further ſtrength of faith.* And as a man in danger of drowning catcheth for hold to ſaue himſelfe, ſo whileſt the comfort of life maketh offer to goe from vs, we take the better hold thereof, and it becommeth ſo much the more precious and deare vnto vs. But as wee doe not approue ſinne, for that it is vſed ſometimes for a helpe of righteouſneſſe, ſo no more doe wee commend doubting, for that it is vſed for the increaſe of faith, but as againſt the one ſo againſt the other wee fight and labour to abandon it wholly from vs, that wee may ſay, [b] *Who ſhall ſeparate vs from the loue of Chriſt? ſhall tribulation, or anguſh, or perſecution, or famine, or nakedneſſe, &c? Nay in all theſe things wee are more then conquerers through him that loued vs. For I am perſwaded that neither life, nor death, nor things preſent, nor things to come, nor any creature ſhall bee able to ſeparate vs from the loue of God*

[a] *Auguſt. de verb. Dom. Ser. 36. Fides fundit orationem, fuſa oratio impetrat fidei firmitatem.*

[b] Rom. 8. 35.

*God which is in Christ Iesus our Lord.* Thus therefore we so take the words of *Austin*, as that we leaue place for that which elsewhere he saith, that [c] *God saith to the soule of the faithfull, I am thy Saluation*, whereupon it is *boldly to say to him, Thou art my God*, which, saith he, *is no rashnes or presumption, but affection of desire and sweetnesse of hope.* For that voice of God whereby hee *saith to our soule*, as *Dauid* for himselfe prayeth, *I am thy Saluation*, what is it else but [e] *the spirit that giueth witnesse to our spirit that wee are the sonnes of God?* The words of *Gregorie* if there bee any such, for in the place by him cited they are not, may import, how ready our corruption is to misconuert the graces and gifts of God, but to deny to the faithfull man the knowledge of Gods grace in himselfe, is to bereaue him of all stedfast hope, and to quench in him all true conscience of thankfulnesse towards God, because he cannot hope, that knoweth nothing whereupon to hope, nor hartily giue thanks that knoweth not whether hee haue cause to giue thanks or not. And how doth *S. Iohn* say, [f] *By this we know that we are in him and he in vs, because he hath giuen vs of his spirit*, if we do not know that he hath giuen vs of his spirit? and how should wee not know that wee haue receiued grace, if we know that we haue receiued the spirit of grace? But of this matter sufficient hath bene spoken in the former section. Now whereas *M. Bishop* saith that *God doth not ordinarily assure men at the first of their owne Saluation*, if he meane that God doth not at the first offer any such assurance, hee saith vntruly. For God speaketh by the same word in the beginning and in the end, and therefore both in the beginning and in the end, giueth the same assurance, although our faith being perhaps weake, doth not by and by so fully & firmely lay hold thereof. Therfore whereas he compareth God to *a master who wil not at the first entrance into his seruice infeofe his seruãt to the fee simple of those lands which after vpon his good deserts he meaneth to bestow vpon him*, he doth wrong to the maiesty of God, thus to limit his bounty to the prouident and wary courses of men, occasioned, partly by their ignorãce, & vncertainty of other mens future condition, & partly by their impotency and vnablenes to preuent & help that, that haply may proue amisse. For mã knoweth not what the behauior of his seruãts hereafter wil be, wheras he intẽdeth his gift no otherwise to him but vpon his good behauior, neither is it in his power to better it, if he become of worse quality

c *August. in Psal.* 32. *Non est ista temeritas: affectus est desiderij, dulcedo spei. Dicat anima, omnino securã dicat, Deus meus es tu, quis dicit animæ, salus tua ego sum.*

d Psa. 35. 3.

e Rom. 8. 16.

f 1. Iohn. 4. 13.

then he expected: but God from the beginning knoweth our mould and making, and that there is no good qualitie to be expected of vs, but what the power of his owne hand graciously worketh in vs, and therefore his promise is what he will doe for vs, not what he would haue vs to do for our selues, and as he freely giueth vs the inheritance, so taketh vpon him selfe [g] *to make vs meete to be partakers of his inheritance*. To which purpose *S. Austin* notably speaketh, wholy ouerthrowing *M. Bishops* comparison; [h] *God promised to men fellowship with God, immortality to vs beeing mortall, iustification to vs beeing sinners, glorification to vs being abiects and castawaies. Whatsoeuer hee promised, hee promised to vs being vnworthy, that it might not bee promised as a wages or reward for works, but beeing grace by name, might be gratis and freely giuen, because to liue iustly, so farre as man can liue iustly, is not a matter importing mans merit but the benefit and gift of God.* Let *M. Bishop* therefore learne hereby, that God doth not rest vpon our good behauiour to infeofe vs to the *fee simple of the land of the liuing*, but that good behauiour it selfe is a part of that blessing whereto by his free promise he hath infeofed vs. The originall of which infeofement consisteth in the grace of Gods election, the *liuerie and seisin* in the grace of his adoption, wherein he hath made vs his children and [i] *heires as touching hope of euerlasting life*, which therefore we expect by title of inheritance, not by purchase of merit, hauing receiued for [k] *earnest and pledge thereof* the *spirit of* Christ, sanctifying and preparing vs thereunto. Which sanctification notwithstanding he so measureth out vnto vs whilest wee liue here, as that he leaueth vs nothing whereof to glory in our selues: but when we measure our selues to his iudgement, we see still that there is that corruption remaining in vs for which he might take occasion iustly to condemne vs, that therefore [l] *wee may know at that day*, as Saint *Bernard* saith, *that, not for the workes of righteousnesse which we haue done, but of his owne mercie he hath saued vs.* Rightly therefore doth *M Perkins* say, that *in regard of our selues and our owne indisposition wee haue to despaire of our Saluation, euen to the very death, as beeing vnworthy thereof.* But saith *M Bishop, Not so good Syr, because we know that he bestoweth mercy vppon the vnworthy in the first iustification of a sinner.* But what is that to giue vs hope, to say that God in Baptisme sheweth mercie to vs though

g Col. 1 12.

h *August. in Ps. 109. Promisit hominibus diuinitatem, mortalibus immortalitatem, peccatoribus iustificationem, abiectis glorificationem. Quicquid promisit indignis promisit, vt non quasi operibus merces promitteretur sed gratia à suo nomine gratis diceretur; quia hoc ipsum iustè viuere inquantum homo potest iustè viuere non meriti humani sed beneficij diuini est.*

i Tit 3.7.

k Ephes. 1.14.

l *Bernard in Cant serm. 50. Vt sciamus in die illa quia non ex operibus iustitiæ, &c.*

though vnworthy, if it bee true which hee addeth, that *hee will not admit into the kingdome of heauen any vnworthy*; when as after Baptisme we are all so farre from being worthy thereof? Nay saith hee, *God giues men grace while they liue to worke that they are made worthy of his heauenly kingdome.* But where is that man that hath receiued so great grace, as that he may be thought to be made worthy of the heauenly kingdome? *Iohn* Baptist saith of Christ, [m] *I am not worthy to loose the latchet of his shoe*; and who is hee then of whome it may bee said, that hee is worthy to raigne with Christ in his kingdome of glorie? The Centurion of whome Christ gaue testimony, that [n] *hee found not so great faith, no not in Israel*, yet confesseth of himselfe, [o] *I am not worthie that thou shouldest enter vnder my roofe*; who is he then of whome we may be perswaded that he is worthie to enter vnder the roofe of heauen? [p] *No man sheweth such conuersation of life*, saith *Chrysostome*, *as that hee is worthy of the heauenly kingdome, but this is wholly the gift of God.* How then shall we beleeue *M. Bishop*, that any man so worketh, as that thereby hee is made worthy of the heauenly kingdome? As for the place which he citeth out of the Reuelation, it is at large to be handled, as is this whole poinct concerning worthinesse, in the question of *Merits*, and therefore thither I referre the Reader for the explication thereof.

[m] Mar.1.7.

[n] Mat.8.10.
[o] Ver.8.

[p] *Chrysost. in Col. hom.2. Nemo talem vitæ conuersationem ostendit vt regno dignus esse possit, sed hoc totum est donum Dei.*

## 8. W. Bishop.

*The fift reason for our opinion is taken out of* M. Perkins *second exception, to wit; howsoeuer a man may bee assured for his present state, yet no man is certaine of his perseuerance to the end. And therefore, although we might be assured of our Iustification, yet can we not be certaine of our Saluation.* For hee onely that perseuereth to the end, shall bee saued. M. Perkins *answer is, that praier doth assure vs to perseuer to the end: for God bids vs pray, that wee fall not into temptation, and promiseth an issue foorth: So then the assurance depends vpon praier, and not vpon our former faith. What then if wee doe not pray so as wee should? may not the enemie then, not onely wound, but kill vs to? it cannot bee denied: and herein, as in diuerse other workes of pietie, many haue beene too too slacke, as the pitifull fall of thousands haue taught vs.* Oh *saith* M. Perkins, it cannot bee, that hee which

1.Cor.10.

was once a member of Christ, can euer after bee wholly cut off. *O shameleſſe aſſertion, and contrarie to many plaine texts, and examples of holie Scriptures: Doth not our Sauiour ſay in expreſſe words,* That euerie branch in me not bearing fruit, he wil take it away? *And againe,* If any abide not in me, he ſhall be caſt forth as the branch, & ſhall wither, and bee caſt into the fire: *which doth demonſtrate, that ſome which were members of Christ, be wholly cut eff, and that for euer. Are we not by faith made members of Christ by our aduerſaries owne confeſſion? and doth not our bleſſed Sauiour ſay, expounding the parable of the ſower,* That the ſeed which fell vpon the rocke, doth ſignifie them, who with ioy receiue the word, and theſe (*ſaith hee*) haue no roote, but for a time they beleeue, and in time of temptation reuolt? *Doth not* S. Paul *in expreſſe tearmes ſay,* That ſome hauing faith and good conſcience, expelling good conſcience, haue made ſhipwrack of their faith? *of whom were by name,* Hymenæus *and* Alexander. *The like,* That in the laſt daies, ſome ſhould reuolt from the faith: *Againe,* That ſome for couetouſneſſe ſake, had erred from the faith. *And for example amongſt other, take* Saul *the firſt king of Iſrael, who was at his election (as the holie Ghoſt witneſſeth) ſo good a man,* that ther was no better then hee in all Iſrael, *and yet became reprobate, as is in Scripture ſignified. The like is probable of* Solomon, *and in the newe Teſtament of* Iudas *the traitor,* & Simon Magus *whom* S. Luke *ſaith,* that he alſo himſelfe beleeued, *and after became an Arch-heretike, and ſo died: the like almoſt may be verified of all Arch-heretikes, who before they fell, were of the faithfull.*

Ioh.15.

Luc.8.

1.Tim.1.19.

1.Tim.4.

1.Tim.6.

1.Reg.19.

1.Reg.15.&16.

Act.8.

R. ABBOT.

This argument were ſomewhat worth, if God hauing made vs partakers of his grace did thenceforth leaue vs to our ſelues and to our owne keeping, for then there were not onely caſualtie but certaintie of our falling away from him. But looke by what our faith aſſureth vs of preſent ſtanding, by the ſame and as farre it ſecureth vs againſt future falling, the aſſurance of faith beeing that [a] *neither things preſent nor* THINGS TO COME *ſhall ſeparate vs from the loue of God, which is in Christ our Lord.* It looketh vpon God as a carefull father, who himſelfe [b] *teacheth all his children* that they may bee ſure to learne; as a good ſhepheard that [c] *ſo gathereth his flocke*

[a] Rom.8.38.

[b] Eſa.54.13. Ieremi.31.33.

[c] Ier.23.3 4.

*flocke as that none of them shall be lacking*: as a good husbandman, that so fenceth [d] *his vineyard and keepeth it night and day, that none assaile* or hurt it; as a [e] *rocke* strong and sure, so that *the gates of hell shall not preuaile against the Church* of the faithfull, that are founded and built vpon it. It looketh vnto Gods promise, [f] *I will put my feare into their hearts that they shall not depart from mee*, wherby it expecteth perpetuall and assured establishment from him alone. It looketh vnto the mediation of Christ, who hath not prayed for *Peter* only, that [g] *his faith might not faile*, but [h] *for all that beleeue in him; Holy Father keepe them in thy name*: whereupon the Apostle *Peter* telleth vs, that [i] *wee are kept by the power of God through faith vnto Saluation*. Hee that keepeth vs *by faith*, must necessarily bee vnderstood to preserue and keepe our faith, not by any power of ours, but by his owne onely power, [k] *who since the fall of man will not haue it to belong to any thing but his only grace, that either we come vnto him or do not afterwards depart from him*. In a word, faith seeth in the word of God that the worke of grace is irreuocable, and standeth fast and inuiolate for euer, [l] *neither doth God blind them whom he hath enlightened, nor destroy* [m] *what he hath builded, nor plucke vp what he hath planted, because the gifts and calling of God are without repentance*, [m] *that is, they are firmely established to bee without any change*, so that [n] *whom he hath called and iustified, them he glorifieth*, because [o] *he calleth and iustifieth none but whom hee hath predestinated* vnto glorie; and therefore it followeth, that hee giueth them *perseuerance* for the *attainement* of the said glorie. [p] *The Father*, saith *Ambrose, that was the giuer cannot reuoke his gifts, nor put away him from the grace of his fatherly affection, whom he hath entertained and receiued by adoption.* [q] *For such is the grace of God*, saith *Chrysostome*, *it hath no end, it neuer determineth, but still proceedeth to greater benefits. Which is not wont to be so in the gifts of men: for a man hauing obtained an office, an honor or principality, hath no perpetuity therein, but is soone bereft of it. For albeit the hand of man do not take it away, yet death will, which speedily shall ouertake him. But the good gifts which God giueth are not so, as from which neither man, nor time, nor any power*

d Esa. 27. 3.
e Mat. 16. 18.
f Ier. 32. 40.
g Luke 22. 32.
h Iohn. 17. 11. 20.
i 1 Pet. 1. 5.
k *Augustin. de bono perseuer. cap. 7. supra.* Of Free will Sect. 14
l *Idem ad artic. sibi falsò impos. art. 12. Nec quæ illuminauit obcecat, nec quæ ædificauit destruit, nec quæ plantauit euellit. Sine pœnitentia enim sunt dona & vocatio Dei.*
m *De prædest. sanct. ca. 16. id est, sine mutatione stabilitèr fixa sunt.*
n Rom. 8. 30.
o *Augustin. de prædest. sanct. ca. 17. Non alios sed quos prædestinauit, ipsos & vocauit, &c.*
p *Ambros. de Iacob. & vit. beat. li. 1. cap. 6. Num Deus pater ipse qui contulit potest donat sua rescindere, et quos adoptione suscepit eos à paterno affectu gratia relegare.*
q *Chrys. in Rom. hom. 9. Talis ipsa Dei gratia finem nullum habet, terminum non nouit, sed & ad maiora semper propagatur atque progreditur. Id quod non sic in hominibus visum nit; verbi gratia,*

*assecutus est quis magistratum, gloriam, principatum: tamen in eo perpetuus non manet, sed consestim ab eo excutitur. Nam vt honorem illum humana manus non eripuat, certè superueniens mors omnino eripiura est. At quæ Deus bona largitur, hæc quæquam talia sunt, à quibus videlicet non homo, non tempus, non rerum aduersarum vis, non ipse diabolus, non mors ingruens, deturbare nos poterit, quin vel mortui cum simus, tum demùm firmiùs ea possidemus, atque adeo quo progredimur magis, eo maioribus effectis fruimur.*

of aduersities, nor the diuell, nor death approaching can remoue vs, yea when we are dead, we do more assuredly possesse the same. In a word [r] it is impossible, saith Origen, that that which God quickneth should bee slaine, either by himselfe or any other. It is true then that hee (onely) that perseuereth to the end shall bee saued, but it is true also that God giueth perseuerance vnto Saluation to all them to whom he hath giuen the true faith of Saluation, [s] such a gift of perseuerance, as not onely without which they cannot perseuere, but by which they doe no other but perseuere, or by which they doe certainly perseuere, so as that their faith doth neuer finally faile, neither shall their end find it but continuing in them. As touching this point *M. Perkins* answered very effectually, that wee pray that God would not suffer vs to bee wholy ouercome of the diuell in any temptation, when we say, Leade vs not into temptation, and that to this petition wee haue a promise answerable, that God with temptation will giue an issue, and therefore that the diuell howsoeuer he wound the faithfull, yet shall neuer bee able vterly to ouercome them. Whereto *M. Bishop* very idlely replieth according to his maner, by a fallacie of diuision, that then the assurance dependeth vpon prayer, and not vpon our former faith. But let him take the same answer in effect againe, that the assurance still dependeth vpon faith, which [t] faith is the fountaine of prayer, which prayer beggeth of God as Christ hath commanded, Lead vs not into temptation, which to whomsoeuer it is graunted, [u] he by the gift of God perseuereth in that sanctification which by the gift of God he hath receiued, because no man faileth of perseuerance but by being led into temptation: and concerning temptation the Apostles words import the promise of God to all the faithfull, [x] God is faithfull, who will not suffer you to bee tempted aboue your strength, but together with the temptation will giue the issue, that ye may be able to beare it. Whereupon S. *Ambrose* saith most notably to the purpose wee haue in hand, [y] Therefore doth the Apostle say, that God is faithfull and will not suffer them to be tempted aboue their strength, because he hath promised to giue the kingdome of heauen to them that loue him, and must needs giue the same because hee is faithfull. For that cause

[r] Origen. in Ierē. hom. 1. Impossibile est quod semel vnificauit Deus aut ab ipso aut ab alio occidi.

[s] Aug. de corrupt. & grat. ca. 12. Sanctis in regnum Dei per gratiam Dei predestinatis tale adiutorium perseuerantiæ datur: vt eis perseuerātia ipsa donetur non solum vt sine isto dono perseuerantiæ esse nō possint, verum etiam vt per hoc donum nōnisi perseuerātes sint & fides eorum non deficit vsque in finem, nec eam nisi manentem vitæ huius vsurpat finis.

[t] Aug. de verb. Dom. Ser. 36. Fidei fons orationis.

[u] Idem de bono pesteuer. cap. 6. Si conceditur es quod orat vt non inferatur in tentationem in sanctificatione vtique quam Deo donante percepit, Deo donante persistit. Et paulo prius: Neque quisquam perseuerare desistit nisi in tentatione primitus inferatur.

[x] 1. Cor. 10. 13.

[y] Amb. in 1. Cor. 10. Ideo fidelem dixit Deum, &c. quia daturum se promisit Deum dilectoribus se regna cælestia, &c. Non potest necesse est quia fidelis est. Propterea ergo tribulatio pro se aderit, nec patietur tantum irrogari vt tolerari non possit, sed faciet vt aut cuncta cesset tentatio, aut si proxima fuerit det tolerandi virtutem, alioquin non habet quod promisit quia vincetur qui patitur. Honos est enim infirmitatis subiectus & vas erit qui accipiat. Sed quia fidelis est Deus qui promisit subuenit vt impleat quod promisit, &c. Non plus permittitur ei imponi quam sciatur ferri posse, vt quæratur de patientia nostra per tentationes quasi scitur vltra non posse quàm triduo tolerare.

there-

*therefore he will be present to them being in trouble for his sake, and will not suffer so much to be laid vpon them as is not to be suffered, but either will cause the temptation to cease, or if it be long, will giue strength to endure it: otherwise he shall not giue that which he promised, because the party suffering shall be ouercome, being a man subiect to infirmity, and so shall not bee to receiue the promise. But because God is faithfull which hath promised, he helpeth him, that he may fulfill his promise, and no more is permitted to be laid vpon him, then it is knowne to God that he is able to beare, so that he is not suffred to be tempted the fourth day that is knowne not to be able to endure beyond the third day.* So then by this fathers iudgement, the Apostle in those words giueth to vnderstand, that God hauing promised to the faithfull the kingdome of heauen, doth so prouide, as that he may performe vnto them his promise, which he shold not performe, if either their own lightnes or any aduerse power shold preuaile to make them vncapable thereof, and therefore he suffereth them not by any temptation to bee taken away from him, but giueth them constancy and perseuerance whereby they wade out of the flouds thereof, that they neuer bee drowned in them. This is the promise of God, and this promise faith apprehendeth, and accordingly praieth and beleeueth according to the promise, that it shall obtaine that which it praieth for, and therefore shall not by any temptation be vtterly ouerthrown. But *what then*, saith M. Bishop, *if we pray not so as we ought! may not the enemy then not onely wound but also kill vs?* We answer, Yes indeed *M. Bishop*, he would so, and both faith & praier, and al would faile, if God were not the keeper and maintainer thereof. But it hath beene before said, that *faith is the fountaine of praier*, and therefore God in the keeping of our faith, continueth our praier, because the streame cannot faile, so long as the fountaine faileth not. Praier is the breath of faith, which neuer ceaseth to breath, so long as it is aliue. Praiers are the beames of faith, if the light of faith be not quenched, it certainly sendeth forth his beams of praier. *Christ therefore hauing praied for his, that their faith may not faile, it shal neuer faile finally in any of them.* And therefore they shal neuer vtterly giue ouer to pray vnto him, that it may be fulfilled to the which is promised, *euery one that calleth vpon the name of the Lord, shall be saued.* And surely God wanteth not meanes whereby to preserue and continue both the one & the other, not onely by instruction & aduertisment of the word & sacraments, but also by correction and discipline of crosses.

z. *Augus. de corr. & grat. ca. 12. Pro his interpellauit Christus ne deficiat fides eorum, sine dubio non deficiet, vsque in finē.*

a *Rom. 10. 13.*

croſſes and afflictions, and many greuances of temptations, by which as occaſion ſeruеth, he fretteth off the ruſt, & bloweth away the aſhes of carnal ſecurity; by occaſion whereof as children affrighted or greiued, runne to their father for ſuccor, ſo are we moued to go by praier vnto God, according to the ſaying of the Prophet *Eſay*: b *Lord in affliction they haue viſited thee, they haue powred forth a praier when thy chaſtiſement was vpon them.* Albeit therefore of our ſelues we eaſily grow ſlack both in praier, and in all other works of pietie & godlineſſe, yet God prouideth to the contrary, to keepe the fire of his ſpirit continually burning in our hearts, c *opening our eares by his corrections, to cauſe vs to ceaſe from our (euill) enterpriſes, and to heale our pride, and to keepe back our ſoule frō the pit*: which is the ſame that the Apoſtle ſaith: d *When we are iudged, we are chaſtened of the Lord, that we may not be condemned with the world.* And whereas *M. Biſhop* alledgeth, that *thouſands pitifully fall away*, we anſwer him, that they which finally fall, did neuer truly ſtand, though they ſeemed to ſtand, nor euer did truly beleeue, though they ſeemed to beleeue, but euen of their fals doth God alſo make vſe, to make thoſe that are truly his to ſtand the faſter, ſtriking thereby a dread & feare into their hearts, whereby they abhorre to think of that befalling in themſelues, which hath befallen in the other, that they may the more inſtantly call vpon him, and embrace the meanes whereby they ſhould firmly apprehend & take hold of him. We ſay the ſame that *M. Perkins* doth, that *it cannot be that he that is once indeed a member of Chriſt, can euer after be wholy cut off.* But this diſliketh *M. Biſhop* much, ſo that he exclaimeth, *O ſhameleſſe aſſertion!* Where we may more iuſtly cry out of him, O ſhameleſſe man, that maketh Chriſt leſſe affectionate & kind to the ſpirituall members of his myſticall body, then he himſelf is to the earthly members of his own naturall body. *M. Biſhop* wil not ſuffer any member of his body to putrifie & rot away, if he can ſaue it; and wil he make vs beleeue, that Chriſt ſuffereth his mēbers to rot away frō him? Shal we think that Chriſt doth leſſe reſpect a faithfull ſoul, thē any of vs doth reſpect a finger or a toe? e *Can Chriſt condemn thee*, ſaith *Ambroſe* to the true beleeuing man, *whom he himſelfe hath redeemed frō earth, and whoſe life he knoweth to be the reward of his own death? Wil he not ſay, What profit is there in my bloud, if I condemn him whō I haue ſaued?* He is faithful & wil not deny himſelf; he wil not vndo that which he hath done, nor blot out his owne name, or ſuffer it to be blotted out, which he hath written

b Eſa 26.16.

c Job.33.16.17.

d 1.Cor.11.32.

e *Ambroſ. de Iacob. & vit. beat. l. 1. ca. 6. Poterit ergò ille te damare quē redemit a morte, pro quo ſe obtulit, cuius vitam mortis ſuæ mercedem eſſe cognouit? Nōne dicit, Quæ vilitas in ſanguine meo, ſi damno quē ipſe ſanauī?*

written by his spirit, in the hart of euery one that beleeueth. He wil not dismember himselfe, or receiue a maime in that *body which* (generally in the whole, & respectiuely in euery part) *is the fulnes of him that filleth all in all.* Seeing therfore euery true beleeuer is truely a mẽber of this body, & helpeth to make vp this *fulnesse* of Christ, it cãnot be that Christ should suffer any true beleeuer to perish: but quickeneth & cherisheth euery such mẽber with his spirit of life, & healeth the wounds and sicknesses therof, that it may neuer die. But of this point further in the section next saue one, here it shall suffice to examine those texts & examples of holy Scriptures, which he saith are cõtrary to that that *M. Perkins* her affirmeth. Which if they be *many* and *plaine*, as he saith, we may thinke him a very silly man, that of those *many* could make no better choice then he hath done. The first place is that of our Sauiour Christ, [g] *Euery branch in me not bearing fruit, he will take away.* Wherein the Reader may easily see, that he doth but only abuse the simplicitie and ignorance of such as cannot espie his fraud. He telleth vs of *taking away the branches that beare no fruit*, whereas the matter in question is of the perseuerance of those branches that do bring forth fruit. We doubt not but the *branches* which beare no fruit shalbe *taken away*, but we speake of *branches*, which as touching *present state* do bring forth fruit, & of thẽ our Sauiour addeth, [h] *Euery braech that beareth fruit, the father purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit.* The *branch* thẽ that beareth fruit shal perseuer, & shall neuer be cut off, because the *Father purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit.* But *M. Bishop* will vrge that Christ saith, *Euery branch in me*, therby to signifie, that euẽ those branches which do not beare fruit are in Christ, and yet are cut off & taken away. But there is no necessitie of any such construction: the words are rather to be taken as we read thẽ, *Euery branch that beareth not fruit in me.* For euery man is compared *to a branch*, & naturally we are al brãches of a wild vine, as we grow frõ the corrupted stocke of *Adam*, & bring forth none but sowre & vnsauourie fruit, so that to bring forth good fruit we had need to be transplanted & remoued from the stocke of *Adam*, to be ingraffed into Christ. And this may the words of Christ import, that the Father taketh & destroieth euery branch that stil cõtinueth to bring forth fruit in *Adã*, and is not implanted into Christ to bring forth fruit in him. Which construction if we follow, as is likeliest most probability, there is

[f] Ephes.1.23.

[g] Ioh.15.2.

[h] Ibid.

is nothing ſaid of any to be cut off that is *a branch* in Chriſt the true vine, but of *branches* taken and caſt away that are not in him. But yet granting him that reading of the words which he deſireth, yet he is no whit the nearer to his purpoſe thereby. For men are diuerſly vnderſtood to be in Chriſt; ſome by ſemblance & ſhew, other ſome in deed and truth: ſome by outward calling & profeſſion only; other ſome by grace and inward regeneration: ſome according to the fleſh, and in the eie of the Church, other ſome according to the ſpirit and power of Chriſt, and in the eie of God. The Church is *the floore* wherein is both corne and chaffe; *the field* wherein groweth both wheat & tares; the *net* that catcheth al ſorts of fiſhes both good & bad; the paſture where feed both *ſheepe and goates*: the *banquet houſe* that entertaineth al gueſts that com both clothed & vncloathed, al yet comming vnder the name of *friends*; al ſaying, *Lord, Lord*; al profeſſing themſelues to take part with Chriſt, [i] al *children by communion of Sacraments, whereby there is in them a ſhew of godlineſſe*, but many *thornes by malignity of behauiour, whereby they deny the power thereof*: all *ſheepe* in outward complement & couplement to the Church, but [k] *many wolues* in ſheepes clothing, *lying in wait* to make a ſpoile. Now we are to diſtinguiſh them that truely are in Chriſt, from them that are not ſo. Of them that truly are in Chriſt & in preſent ſtate of iuſtification, our ſpeech here is, that they can neuer wholly be cut off; the reſt we know are cut off from that *which they ſeemed to haue*, but indeed *had not*: which if they had had indeed as they ſeemed to haue, [m] *they ſhould haue had more giuen, that they might haue abundance*, and not be cut off from that they had. It is therefore nothing againſt vs, which *M. Biſhop* alleadgeth, that *fruitleſſe branches*, which in deede are not in Chriſt, though they will ſeeme to be, are cut off from ſeeming any longer to be that which in truth they neuer were. Euery one that truely is *a branch* in Chriſt, bringeth forth friut in him, & *euery branch that bringeth forth fruit, the Father purgeth that it may bring forth more fruit*. Euery one therfore that is truly *a branch* in Chriſt, as euery true beleeuer is, ſhall continue a branch in him for euer, that it may be verified which the Prophet ſaith, [n] *Such as be planted in the houſe of the Lord ſhal flouriſh in the courts of our God. They ſhall ſtill bring forth euen in age and ſhal be fat and flouriſhing*. By this the anſwer is plaine to the other place; *If a man abide not in me, he is caſt forth as a branch, and ſhall wither and*

i Auguſt. de vnit. eccleſ. cap. 13. Vnde appellat ſpinas niſi propter malignitatem morum? Et eaſdem vnde filii niſi propter communionem ſacramentorum? & cap. 12. Propter ſacramenta quæ cum ſanctis communiter habent in eis eſt quædam forma pietatis cuius virtutem non habent.

k De bapt. cont. Donatiſt. lib. 6. c. 1. Charactérem dominicum multi & lupi & lupi inſingunt qui videtur quidem intus eſſe, veruntamen ad illam eam quæ etiã ex multis vna eſt non pertinere morum ſuorum fructibus conuincuntur.

l 1. Cor. 3. 18.

m Mat. 13. 12.

n Pſal. 92. 13.

*and be cast into the fire.* For thereby is imported what befalleth to them, who carying semblance to be in Christ, beare no fruit in him, who because they are not truly that which they seeme to bee, therefore abide not in that which they seeme, and either by death or by other occasion become [o] *corporally separated from the Church, to which they before (but onely) seemed to bee coupled.* It is true then that *if a man abide not in Christ*, though for the time he seeme to be in Christ, he is *cast forth* and perisheth: but it followeth not therefore, that any man that faithfully beleeueth in Christ, and therfore truly is in Christ, doth not abide in him Nay our Sauiour himself teacheth vs the contrary when he saith: [p] *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloud abideth in me and I in him.* For what is it to *eat the flesh of Christ and to drinke his bloud, but* [q] *to beleeue in Christ;* [r] *to be partakers of his passion, and with comfort and vse to lay vp in our minds that his flesh was crucified and wounded for vs?* Euery one then that truly beleeueth in Christ, eateth his flesh & drinketh his bloud and therefore abideth in Christ, and Christ in him. No man therefore that truly beleeueth in Christ, is euer cut off or cast forth to wither or to be throwne into the fire. Now to an indifferent Reader I might alledge, and it easily appeareth by the vse of that terme of *abiding*, that by *abiding in Christ*, is meant our very *being in Christ*, which is therefore so expressed, because no man is in Christ truely and indeed, but the same abideth in him for euer. So that the meaning of Christs words shall bee, If any man be not truely ingrafted into me as the true vine, to grow vpon mee, and to bring forth fruit by me, he is cast forth as a dead and vnprofitable branch, and shal come to nought. But it booteth not to alledge this to a wrangler, who whatsoeuer appeare otherwhere, will not beere vnderstand it otherwise then to serue his owne turne. Against him therefore the other solution is plaine, that whosoeuer beleeueth in Christ, the same abideth in him, and therefore shall neuer be cut off, so that yet he is farre enough from any demonstration, to proue any *who are truely members of Christ, are wholly and for euer cut off from him.* Let vs see whether the rest will affoord him any better demonstration. *Are we not by faith*, saith he, *made members of Christ by our aduersaries own confession?* Yes *M. Bishop*, but yet not by euery kind of faith; for *S. Iames* saith, [s] *The diuels beleeue*, and yet they are not thereby the members of Christ. We are made the members of Christ only by

o *August. epist. 59 Separantur multi ab ecclesia, sed cùm moriuntur, qui tamen cùm viuunt per sacramentorũ cõmunionem vnitatisque Catholicæ videntur ecclesiæ copulati.*

p John 6.56.

q *August. in Ioan tract. 25. 26.*

r *De doct. Christ. lib. 3. cap. 16. Figura est præcipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum, & suauiter atque vtiliter recõdendum in memoria quòd caro eius pro nobis crucifixa & vulnerata fuit.*

s Iam 2.19.

by true and liuely faith, whereby Christ dwelleth in our hearts, of which it is that the Apostle saith, [t] *Ye are all the Children of God by faith in Christ Iesus*. You will not say *M. Bishop*, that by euery faith a mã is spritually made a mẽber of Christ, because you say that there is *faith without charity*, and you dare not say that without charity a man may be a member of Christ. Which being so, how vainly doth he alledge, that [u] our Sauiour saith in *the parable of the sower concerning them that receiue the word in stonie ground, that with ioy they receiue the word, but haue no root, and for a time beleeue, and in time of temptation reuolt*? For though it be said that they *beleeue*, yet it followeth not that they beleeue with that faith whereby they should become the *members of Christ*. For *Herod* in that sort beleeued the word preached by *Iohn Baptist*, [x] *whom he reuerenced as a iust and holy man, & heard him gladly, and did many things accordingly*, and yet hee was not therefore a member of Christ. By conuiction of conscience men oft times receiue the word, and cannot but beleeue & acknowledge the trueth thereof when yet they embrace it not with affection of loue, and therefore haue not that [y] *faith which worketh by loue*, which onely is true faith. And how can he perswade vs that true members of Christ are by Christ himselfe compared to the *stony ground*? Wee are perswaded that onely the *good ground* are the true members of Christ; as for the rest they are [z] *as bad humors in the body* as *S. Austin* saith, but members they are not. And how should there be true *faith* in them of whom Christ saith; *They haue no root*? Can true faith grow where there is no *root* for it to grow vpon? Nay *S. Austine* telleth vs, that *faith* it selfe is [a] *the root* whence all good fruit doth grow, and how can they bee said to haue true faith, of whom it is truely said, that *they haue no root*? To be short, these are said to beleeue (but) *for a time*, but of them that truely beleeue, it is said, [b] *Whosoeuer beleeueth in him shall not be confounded*, and therefore their faith shall neuer faile. The next place is lewdly falsified by him, alledging that *some hauing faith and a good conscience, expelling good conscience, haue made shipwracke of their faith*, whereas *S. Paul* saith not, that *they had faith and a good conscence*, but instructeth *Timothie* for *the fighting of a good fight, to* [c] *haue faith and a good conscience, which (good conscience) some*, saith he, *reiecting haue made shipwrack concerning the faith, of whom are Hymeneus and Alexander*. Where by *faith* as *Oecumenius* obserueth, he meaneth

t Gal. 3.26.

u Mat. 13.20.

x Mar. 6.20.

y Gal. 5.6.

z *August. in Ioan. tract. 3. Infra. sect. 10.*

a *Idem in Psa. 31 Laudo fructum boni operis, sed in fide agnosco radicem.*

b Rom. 9.33.

c 1. Tim. 1.19.

a 4

[a] *a faith and beliefe concerning doctrine, and vnderstanding conscience as touching conuersation; which conscience of good life,* saith he, *they reiecting, made shipwracke of faith. For when a man liueth wickedly he maketh shipwracke concerning faith. For men, that they may not be troubled with the terrour of things to come, labour to perswade their owne minds, that those things are lies which with vs are spoken concerning the resurrection and iudgement to come.* S. *Pauls* words then import that they had professed the faith, that is, the doctrine of faith, the doctrine which in Christianity we beleeue and professe, but they held not [c] *the mysterie of faith in a pure conscience,* they liued lewdly and wickedly in the profession of the faith; their consciences were fraught with the guilt of following their owne vngodly lusts; and therefore they renounced the faith, the doctrine of God, that they might not thereby find any crosse or checke in their damnable and wicked courses. What is this to that true faith, whereby we beleeue in Christ to iustification and righteousnesse; whereby we repose the trust and confidence of our Saluation in him, and do truely call vpon the name of the Lord? That they had not this faith it is plaine, because S *Paul* saith plainely, that *they reiected a good conscience*; for a [f] *good conscience* is alwaies an inseparable companion of an *vnfained faith.* The greater is the impudency of this brabler, who saith as out of the Apostle, that they had *a good conscience,* whereas the words of the Apostle are directly contrary to that hee saith. The other two places are of the same sort, [g] *some in the last daies shall reuolt from the faith,* and [h] *some for couetousnesse, haue erred from the faith,* meaning by faith the doctrin of the Church, as where it is said, [i] *some of the Priests were obedient to the faith*; and againe, [k] *He preacheth the faith which before hee destroied,* and againe, [l] *Rebuke them sharpely that they may be found in the faith,* and therefore in the former of those two places, he opposeth to faith [m] *the doctrines of diuels,* that so *faith* may be known to signifie the doctrine which is of God. That reuolt then is frō the faith of publik preaching which wicked men make shew to receiue onely by hypocriticall & fained faith; not frō faith of priuate conscience wher by only true beleeuers make vse of the faith of publike preaching, to their own comfort & Saluation, which is therefore called [n] *the faith of Gods elect,* because it is found in none but only the *elect.* Thus therfore his places serue not his purpose, let vs see now the examples which he alleageth.

a Oecumen. in 1. Tim. 1. Fidem dicit quæ est circa dogmata; conscientiam vero quæ circa conuersationem est. Quam inquit conscientiam quæ est de recte viuendo repellentes nonnulli. Vbi enim quis reprobi vixerit circa fidem naufragium facit. Siquidem ne terrore futurorum crucientur, suo animo persuadere nituntur mendacia esse quæcunq; apud nos de resurrectione ac iudicio dicuntur.

c 1. Tim. 3. 9.

f 1. Tim. 4. 1.

g 1. Tim. 1. 5.

h Cap. 6. 10.

i Act. 6. 7.

k Gal. 1. 22.

l Tit. 1. 13.

m 1. Tim. 4. 1.

n Tit. 1. 1.

First,

Firſt he bringeth *Saul*, who he ſaith at his election *was ſo good a man as that there was no better then he in Iſrael, & yet became a reprobate.* But his tranſlation is falſe; for by the very circumſtance of the place it is manifeſt, that the holy Ghoſt there deſcribeth the goodlineſſe of *Saules* perſon, not the goodneſſe of his condition. Our tranſla-
[o] 1.Sam.9.2. tion readeth according to the truth of the text, that [o] *he was a goodly yong man and a faire, ſo that among the children of Iſrael there was none goodlier then he: from the ſhoulders vpward he was higher then any of the people.* Which laſt words doe plainely ſhew whereto the reſt are to be referred. So *Pagnine* tranſlateth it, and ſheweth that the Hebrew writers do ſo take it, neither doth there appeare any thing whereby we may conceiue ſpiritually any goodneſſe in him at all, being from the firſt, croſſe and thwart to the commandement of the Lord. The ſecond example is of *Salomon*, of whom he ſaith, that *it is probable that he alſo was a reprobate.* But that is not proba-
[p] 2.Sam.12.24. [q] Verſ.25. [r] 2.Chr.32.10. ble; nay, it is altogether vnprobable, that ſo notable a figure of Chriſt, [p] *whom the Lord loued*, and in token thereof gaue him a name [q] *Iedidiah*, that is, *beloued of the Lord*; of whom in figure of Chriſt he ſaid, [r] *I will be his father and he ſhall my Sonne*, whom it appeareth in the Canticles, he acquainted ſo inwardly with the riches and ſecrets of his grace, that he, I ſay, ſhould after be vtterly reprobate and caſt away. For although God ſuffered him very grieuouſly to fal, that by the diſtraction of that kingdome thereby occaſioned, it might appeare that the kingdome promiſed was not accompliſhed in him, yet it is more then probable by that that we read in his booke of *Eccleſiaſtes*, or the *Preacher*, that he wrot that booke as a monument and token of his conuerſion and repentance, wherin he tooke
[s] Eccleſ.1.12. vpon him the perſon of a [s] *Preacher*, for redreſſe of that which he had offended in the perſon of *a King*. Further, he citeth to his purpoſe the examples of *Iudas the traitor and Simon Magus*, of whom Saint *Luke* ſaith, *that hee beleeued.* Where wee may wonder at at his notable impudency, or rather impiety, that he maketh *Iudas* and *Simon Magus* once members of Ieſus Chriſt. Of *Iudas* our Sauiour Chriſt ſaith, when he was at the beſt, that [t] *he was a diuel, and*
[t] Joh.6.70. *S. Iohn* out of the experience of his whole conuerſation, that [u] *hee*
[u] Cap.12.6. *was a theefe*, thereby ſhewing that it neuer was with any true heart that he followed Chriſt, but onely to make a commodity to himſelfe. Of *Simon Magus*, *S. Luke* ſaith indeed, that [x] *he beleeued*, but
[x] Act.8.13.

ſo

ſo as that *Peter* perceiueth amidſt his beleeuing, that y *his heart was not right in the ſight of God, that he was in the gall of bitterneſſe, and in the bond of iniquity*, whereby it appeareth, that his *beleeuing* was no more but z *a bare aſſenting*, as *Oecumenius* calleth it, to the doctrine of faith, and not that true and effectuall beleeuing whereof we ſpeake. Such members of Chriſt doth he make, doing wrong to Ieſus Chriſt, onely to hide his owne ſhame, that hee might not be thought to maintaine a wrong. The like he affirmeth of all *Archheretikes*, that firſt they were *of the faithfull*, expreſſely contrary to that which S. *Iohn* ſaith, a *They went out from vs, but* THEY VVERE NOT OF VS: *for if they had bene* OF VS, *they would haue continued with vs.* Which being ſo plainely affirmed by the Apoſtle, we may maruell that *M. Biſhop* ſhould ſay the contrary, but that he hath harneſſed his face & his conſciẽce, that it may be no bluſh nor ſcruple to him, to auouch one lie for the vpholding of another. What his exception is to that place of *Iohn*, we ſhall ſee in the next ſection but one, where he hath taken vpon him the anſwere of it.

Ver. 21. 23.

z Oecumen. in epiſt. Iacob. cap. 2. Et de ſimplici aſſenſu fidem dicere ſolemus.

a 1. Iohn 2. 19.

## 9. W. BISHOP.

*But what need we further proofe of this matter, ſeeing that this is coſengerman, if not the very ſame, with one of that infamous heretike* Iouinians *erronious articles, condemned and regiſtred by* S. Heirome, *and* S. Auguſtine, *who held, that iuſt men after Baptiſme could not ſinne, and if they did ſinne, they were indeed waſhed with water, but neuer receiued the ſpirit of grace: his ground was, that he which had once receiued the ſpirit of grace, could not ſin after, which is iuſt* M. Perkins *propoſition: ſo that to vphold an errour, he falleth into an old condemned hereſie. And which is yet more abſurd, in the next confirmation, he letteth ſlip at once a brace of other hereſies, theſe be his words:* And if by ſinne one were wholy ſeuered from Chriſt for a time, in his recouery he is to be baptized the ſecond time. *Where you haue firſt rebaptizing, which is the principall errour of the Anabaptiſts, and with all the hereſie of the Nouatians, who held, that if any in perſecution denyed Chriſt after baptiſme, there was no remedy left in Gods church for their recouery, but muſt be left to God: ſo ſaith* M. Perkins, *for that of rebaptizing, hee ſeemes to bring in* ex abſurdo: *ſo that the common ſaying is verified in him,* (one abſurditie being graunted, a thouſand follow after.)

Haref. 82. lib. 2. cont. Iouin.

*But doth he know no other meanes then Baptisme to recouer one cut off from Christ? hath he forgotten that corrupted sentence of the Prophet wherewith they begin their Common praier?* What houre soeuer a sinner doth repent him of his sinne, &c *With them repentance, and with vs the Sacrament of Penance, serue a man at any time of his life to be reconciled to Christ.*

R. Abbot.

We may here take knowledge of the absurd folly of this prater, who hauing before chalenged *M. Perkins* for affirming that *sinne is alwaies in the regenerate corrupting all his works*, goeth about here to lay vpon him an imputation of maintaining, that the *regenerate cannot sinne*. Surely both these cannot stand together, and if *M. Perkins* hold the one, he must needs be a stranger to the other. But thus hee babbleth without feare or wit, neuer regarding how one part of his speech hath coherence with the other. As touching *Iouinian*, if he simply taught that which *Hierome* and *Austine* affirme, that the regenerate cannot sinne, he erred greatly therein, and we ioine with *Austine* and *Hierome* in the condemning of that opinion. But if they did misunderstand his opinion, and that he held onely this, as in likelihood he did, that the regenerate cannot finally and vtterly fall away by sinne, or sinne that sinne which is *vnto death*, and onely meant as *S. Iohn* doth, *Whosoeuer is borne of God sinneth not, neither can he sinne, because he is borne of God*, he erred no whit at all, nor affirmed any thing therein, but what *Hierome* and *Austine* haue affirmed as well as he: and *M. Bishop* knew well enough, that it is this onely that *M. Perkins* deliuered: not that the regenerate cannot, or do not sinne, whose fals wee confesse to be very many, and to themselues very grieuous from day to day, but that the regenerate doth not so sinne, as vtterly to bee cut off from Christ; that the faithfull man doth neuer finally or wholly fall away from the grace of God. To which purpose *S. Bernard* saith: [b] *The Lord knoweth who are his, and the purpose of God abideth vnmooueable. Although* Dauid *be branded with the brand of horrible sinnes, although* Mary Magdalen *be fraught with seuen deuils, although* Peter *the chiefe of the Apostles, be drowned in the depth of denying his maister Christ, yet there is none that can take them (or plucke them)*

a 1. Iohn 3.9.

b *Bernard. de tripl. coherent. vincul. &c. Nouit Dominus qui sunt eius, & propositū Dei manet immobile. Et si horrendorum criminum nota Dauid inuritur, et si Maria Magdalene septē dæmonijs cumulatur, etsi princeps Apostolorum in profundum negationis submergitur, non est tamen qui de manu Dei possit eruere.*

*them out of the hands of God*: not that it is incident to the faithfull, to walke in malicious and wilfull sinne, but when by occasion or temptation he falleth, the Lord [c] *looketh vpon him* as he did vpon *Peter*, that hee may repent; the [d] *Lord putteth vnder his hand*, and lifteth him vp againe. Wee see therefore how little trust is to bee giuen to him, who sticketh not to deliuer so manifest and apparant vntruth. Hee is like the carriers horse, that brooketh not to goe out of his accustomed way: we had had no book of him, if he had bene tyed to speake nothing but what is true. Now *M. Perkins* for assertion of the perseuerance of the faithfull, addeth further, that if a man be a member of Christ, he cannot be *wholy cut off*, not so much as for a time, much lesse for euer. For if he could *wholly* be cut off for the time, then at his returne hee ought to be baptized againe, which beeing absurd to affirme, it followeth that a man cannot *wholly be cut off*. In which confirmation *M. Bishop* saith, that *hee hath let slip a brace of other heresies*. VVhere we may conceiue, that he was mightily a-dreamed of heresies the night before hee wrote this, and they ranne so thicke in his head, that he imagined euery man that he met with, to be an hereticke. Surely *M. Bishop*, if he haue *let slip a brace of heresies*, he hath let them slip out of your collars, and therefore you must take them to your selues; for his they are not. You say by and by after, that *he bringeth in that of rebaptizing ex absurdo*, and if he bring it in as an absurdity, then it is not likely that it should slip from him. Full wisely therefore do you say, that the *common saying is viriſied in him, one absurditie graunted, a thousand follow after*, when *the absurditie graunted* is yours and not his, that *a man is wholly cut off from Christ, hauing been a member of his body*, whereuppon hee inferreth, that there should then be a necessity of rebaptizing, as a consequence of your absurdity, not as an assertion of his owne. A man would scant thinke you well in your wits, to handle a matter so crossely and vntowardly as you do. As touching the matter, albeit litterally it bee true, that *a man being wholly cut off frō Christ, must necessarily be baptized to enter him againe*, yet in that sense, wherein we here speak of *cutting off from Christ*, namely concerning spirituall and inward grace, I confesse ingenuously that there is no necessity of that consequence which Maister *Perkins* inferreth thereupon. If a man be *wholly cut off from Christ*, hee hath no interest in Christ, nor

[c] Luc. 22. 61.

[d] Psal. 37. 24.

Christ in him; the bond of baptisme is dissolued, neither doth there stand any relation thereby betwixt Christ and him. For if there stand any tiall or bond betwixt Christ and him, then is hee not wholly cut off. Supposing then a man after baptisme to bee wholly cut off, which cannot bee till finall impenitencie haue for euer diuided him from the body of the Church, but this yet being supposed, there should be a necessitie of baptizing him againe, to giue him admission into the societie of Christs Church. For that this cannot be done by *M. Bishops* sacrament of penance, hee himselfe must needs confesse, because their sacrament of penance is as they call it, *secunda tabula post naufragium*; and he that is so *wholly cut off*, wanteth the first, without which the *second* hath no place. Or if he doe not want the first, if he doe not want the title of baptisme, then he is not *wholly cut off*, which is the thing to bee supposed. The Church of Rome holdeth, that baptisme leaueth in the soule, *indelebilem characterem, a character or print that can neuer bee disprinted.* But suppose the same to bee defaced and disprinted, and then I suppose that Master *Bishop* will grant, that there is a necessitie to be baptized againe. It cannot be, saith hee, and so say we, that it cannot be, that a man baptized should wholly bee cut off from Christ, but that by outward calling Christ and his Church hath interest in him during life, so as that by true repentance, without any further baptisme, he is restored againe; yet vpon supposall it followeth which wee haue said. Now if Master *Perkins* spake vpon this supposall, it should so follow indeede, but the drift of the matter in hand necessarily draweth vs to another vnderstanding. For when wee say that the regenerate man is neuer wholly cut off from Christ, wee meane it as touching inward and spirituall grace, that it neuer so defecteth, but that there is still * *a seede* thereof *remaining*, that shall grow againe. Yet if we suppose it to be true, which the Papists say, that inward grace of regeneration may be vtterly extermined for the time, I do not conceiue that it should thereof follow, that another baptisme should be needfull for being restored againe. For by the mark of Christ first set vpon him, Christ shall still stand entitled to him, & it shalbe his sin in the mean time, that he applieth not himselfe to him, whose by right he ceaseth not to bee. And if a man in hypocrisie receiue baptisme, so as that hee becom-

* 1. Ioh. 3. 9.

becommeth not thereby at all the member of Christ, yea and thenceforth for the time runne into Paganisme or heresie, we will not hold that if he be afterwards truly conuerted, hee should neede for the making of him a member of Christ, to be secondly baptized, but that baptisme before receiued, now commeth to vse and effect, and yeeldeth that spirituall fruit which it did import before. So therefore though it be supposed that the grace of Christ in any man be vtterly razed and defaced, yet shall it not follow, that hee shall be baptized a second time, but baptisme before receiued shall returne to the same vse that it had before, not by *the* counterfet *Sacrament of penance* deuised by men, but by true and faithfull repentance directed by God, whereof not *by a corrupted sentence*, as this cauiller obiecteth, but by a true expressing of the Prophets meaning, we say in the beginning of our common praier, [f] *At what time soeuer a sinner doth repent him of his sinne from the bottome of his heart, I will put al his wickednesse out of my remembrance, saith the Lord.* As for the *Sacrament of penance*, it is a bastard salue of a false Surgeon: it closeth wounds, and healeth none, but leaueth them to fester and corrupt vnto euerlasting death. There is in it a speciall policie of Satan, to hold men in opinion of forgiuenesse of sinnes where it is not, that they may neglect to seeke it where indeed it is. To come to an end of this matter, whether way *M. Perkins* meant this *cutting off from Christ wholly*, I will not precisely say; but whether way soeuer he meant it, it auaileth *M. Bishop* nothing at all, if haply he did erre in inferring a necessitie on their part, to maintaine an heresie or heresies of others, by maintaining a peruerse opinion of their owne. From which heresies (of Anabaptists and Nouatians) he well knew that we are farre enough; onely he would name them, that wee might vnderstand that hee had heard somewhat thereof.

[f] Ezech. 18. 21. 22.

## 10. W. Bishop.

*But we must answer vnto that of S. Iohn:* They went out from vs, but they were not of vs: for if they had been of vs, they would haue continued with vs. *I answer: If they went out from vs, they were before with vs, which confirmeth our assertion, that men may depart from their faith and Christs profession: but such men were not indeede of*

1. Ioh. 2.

*the number of the elect, of which Saint* Iohn *was, for then either they would haue continued with them in the Christian faith, or else by hearty repentance would haue returned vnto it backe againe, which is* Saint Augustines *owne exposition. And these bee the Arguments for the Catholikes, which* M. Perkins *through his confused order toucheth here and there. To which I will adde, one taken out of the words of S. Paul:* But thou by faith dost stand, be not too highly wise, but fear, if God hath not spared the naturall boughes, least perhaps he will not spare thee neither. *And againe: :* Worke your Saluation, with feare and trembling. *There bee aboue an hundred such texts in holy writ, wherein the Holy Ghost exhorteth vs to stand in feare of our Saluation, out of which I thus frame my argument.*

*De bono perse. cap.* 8.

Rom. 11. 20.

Phil. 2. 12.

No man must stand in feare of that, of which he is by faith assured, But the faithfull must stand in fear of their Saluation. *Ergo* they be not assured of it by faith.

*The* Minor *or second proposition is plainely proued by these places cited before: the* Maior *is manifest: there is no feare in faith, he that feareth, whether the thing be assured or no, cannot giue a certaine assent thereunto:* Dubius in fide infidelis est. *Put the case in another article to make it more euident: He that feareth, whether there be a God or no, do we esteeme that he beleeueth in God? So he that feareth whether* Iesus Christ *be God, is he a Christian? hath he a true faith? You must needs answer, no. So he that feareth whether he shall be saued or no, can haue no faith of his Saluation.*

## R. Abbot.

The place of *S. Iohn* doth fully ouerthrow that which *M. Bishop* laboureth to build, inuincibly prouing, that reuolters and renegates wholly falling away from Christ, were neuer *of the faithfull*, though for the time outwardly they held profession with them. For if they had *beene of vs*, saith hee, *they would haue continued with vs*, therein implying this rule, that they that once are *of the faithfull*, do certainly continue with them, so as that they neuer wholie and finally depart from them. For as falling starres were neuer starres indeed, though they seemed to be starres, so apostatacs and backsliders were neuer faithfull indeed, though they seemed so to

be.

be. But heere Maister *Bishop* answereth, *If they went out from vs, they were before with vs.* Bee it so, but yet as the glosse saith, [a] *by tale and account, not by woorth; by participation of sacraments, not by fellowshippe of loue.* This place then proueth, that men may depart from the profession of the faith of Christ, but it confirmeth not his assertion, that the faith of any doth euer faile, that is truly faithfull in the profession of the faith of Christ. And therefore it is but one of his iuglers tricks, to make his Reader beleeue that the place confirmeth his assertion, when in truth it doth directly contradict it. If those reuolters had had true faith, Saint *Iohn* would not haue said, *They were not of vs*; for he is *of the faithfull*, whosoeuer is indued with true faith. But, saith hee, *S. Iohns* meaning is, that *such were not of the number of the elect, and this is* S. Austines *exposition.* And we acknowledge *S. Austines* expositon to be true; [b] *They were not of them, because they were not called according to purpose, because they were not elect in Christ before the foundations of the world: because they had not obtained any lot (or portion) in him, because they were not predestinate, according to the purpose of him who worketh all things.* But because they were not such, therefore they were neuer truly *faithfull.* For if they were not *called by purpose*, then did they neuer truly beleeue, because [c] *by that calling it is that a man doth beleeue.* Now, [d] *by his calling God calleth no other but whom he hath predestinate:* therefore onely the predestinate doe beleeue. *And no other doth God iustifie, but whom he hath called with that calling*, therefore onely the elect are partakers of iustification; and if only the elect be iustified, then all that are iustified do certainly perseuer, because the elect do neuer fall away. Now if backsliding reprobates were neuer partakers of iustification, then were they neuer of the body of the faithfull, howsoeuer in outward appearance they seemed to be. And this the same S. *Austine*, verie notably confirmeth, when hee saith of reprobates; [e] *None of these doth God bring to spirituall and healthfull repentance, whereby man in Christ is reconciled vnto God, whether he yeeld them patience for longer or shorter time.* And as he excludeth them from true repentance

a *Thom. Aquin. in Ioan. ca. 2. ex glossa. Erant de ecclesia, numero non merito; sacramentorum perceptione, non charitatis communione.*

b *August de bono perseuer. ca. 8. Non erant ex eo quia non erant secundum præpositū vocati: non erant in Christo electi ante constitutionem mundi: non erant in eo sorte consecuti, non erāt prædestinati secundum propositū eius qui vniuersa operatur.*

c *Idem de præd. sanct. cap. 16. Qua vocatione fit credens.*

d *Ibid. cap. 17. Quos prædestinauit, ipsos & vocauit, illa scilicet vocatione secundum propositum. Non ergo alios sed quos prædestinauit, ipsos & vocauit; nec alios sed ita vocauit ipsos & iustificauit, nec alios sed quos prædestinauit, vocauit, iustificauit, ipsos & glorificauit, &c.*

e *Cons. Iulian. Pelag. lib 5. cap. 3. Istorum neminem adducit ad pœnitentiam salubrem & spiritualem qua homo in Christo reconciliatur Deo, siue illis ampliorem patientiam (quam electis) siue non imparem præbeat.*

so doth he also from forgiuenesse of sinnes, saying, that [f] *God forgiueth the sinnes, not of all, but of them whom before hee foreknew and predestinated.* *Origen* yet goeth further, and saith, that [g] *the knowledge of God* (meaning the true and effectuall knowledge of God) *is graunted onely vnto them, who are hereto predestinate, that knowing God they may liue worthy of him.* Now if reprobates neuer haue any true knowledge of God, if they be secluded from repentance, faith, iustification, & forgiuenesse of sinnes, then these things are proper onely to the elect, which do certainely perseuer: and our assertion is true; that where there is true repentance, faith, iustification, knowledge of God, there infallibly followeth perseuerance to the end. Saint *Iohn* therefore when hee saith, *They were not of vs*, as he meaneth that they were not *of the elect*, so he meaneth that they neuer were of the number of true beleeuers, neuer true members of Christ, or of the spirituall body of the Church, which if they had beene, hee concludeth for vs, that they should haue so continued, and not in that sort haue vtterly fallen away. Therefore doth Saint *Austin* expound the words of them, [h] *who for grace temporally receiued, are of vs called the children of God, but yet are not so to God*, affirming plainely, that with God they are not *children*, though wee call them so, because they seeme no other to our sight. And to the same purpose he addeth soone after: [i] *They were not of vs, what meaneth it, but they were not children of God when they went vnder the profession and name of children?* Now if they were neuer *children of God*, then were they neuer truely regenerate; for by being borne of God, they must needs haue beene the children of God. Neither euer had they true faith: for [k] *to so many as beleeued in him, he gaue a dignitie (or prerogatiue) to be the sonnes of God.* Therefore when he saith of such, that *they were in goodnesse, they were in the faith*, it must be vnderstood as touching outward profession, and to the iudgement of the Church, and by assent and approbation of iudgment and vnderstanding, but neuer by integritie & soundnesse of affection, or true regeneration of the heart. Which may appeare by the exposition that he maketh thereof vpon that epistle of *S. Iohn*, where speaking of those apostataes he saith: [l] *So are they in the body of Christ as euill humors in our body.* No members then, no parts of the body, but *as euill humors in the body*, of which some are more kind & lesse offensiue, other altogether vnkind and

f *Cont. aduers. leg. & prophet. l. 2. ca. 11. Qui non omnium, sicut ipse ait, sed eorū quos ante præscitus & prædestinauit delicta dimittit.*

g *Origen. cont. Cels. lib. 7. Conceditur cognitio Dei duntaxat his quia ad hoc prædestinati sunt vt cognito Deo digne viuant.*

h *August. de corrept. & grat. ca. 9. Filij Dei propter susceptam vel temporaliter gratiam dicuntur a nobis, nec sunt tamen Deo.*

i *Ibi l. Cum filij Dei dicunt. Non erant ex nobis, &c. quid aliud dicit, nisi non erant filij, etiam quando erant in professione & nomine filiorum?*

k Iohn 1. 12.

l *August. in 1. Ioan. tract. 3. Sic sunt in corpore Christi quomodo humores mali; quando eiiciuntur non releuant corpus.*

and hurtfull, euen as of theſe temporizers in the Church, ſome come neerer to the true faithfull, other ſome are wholy wicked and diſſembling hypocrites, but of them all it is true,[m] *Temptation proueth that they are not of vs. When temtation befalleth them, euen as it were by occaſion of a wind, they flie out, becauſe they were not corne.* They might ſeeme to be corne: but indeede they were but chaffe: they had a ſemblance, but they had not the realtie of the ſtate of children. *M. Biſhops* expoſition therfore auaileth nothing, but that it ſtill ſtandeth true which we affirme, that true faith as it aſſureth of preſent ſtate, ſo doth aſſure alſo of future perſeuerance, to the end that God may performe to euery beleeuer that which he hath promiſed, that *he ſhall not periſh but haue euerlaſting life*. But becauſe he cannot preuaile by anſwering, he will make further trial what he can do by arguing, taking for ground the words of *S. Paul*, firſt to the Romans, [n] *Thou ſtandeſt by faith, be not high minded but feare:* ſecondly to the Philippians, [o] *Worke your Saluation with feare and trembling*. And to make the better ſhew he ſaith, that *there are aboue a hundred ſuch texts in holy writ, wherin the holy Ghoſt exhorteth vs to ſtand in feare of Saluation*. But if they be ſuch texts as theſe which he hath here alledged, they are admonitions againſt carnall preſumption, and no diſcouragements to true faith to ſtand aſſured of Saluation. The Scripture ſpeaketh diuerſly of feare, and he doth but dally vpon that equiuocation. There is a doubting and diſtracting feare, which God forbiddeth, as being the enemy of all ſpirituall comfort and aſſurance of faith: and there is an awfull and regarding fear, which God commendeth as the vndiuided companion of true faith. As we vnderſtand *feare* to be oppoſit to *faith*, we heare God appointing his miniſters to call his people from it.[p] *Say vnto the fearefull, Be you ſtrong, feare not, behould your God commeth with vẽgeance, he will come & ſaue you.*[q] *Feare not, for I am with thee; be not afraid, for I am thy God; I will ſtrengthen thee and helpe thee, and ſuſtaine thee with the right hand of my iuſtice.* And againe,[r] *Feare not for I haue redeemed thee; I haue called thee by name, thou art mine. When thou paſſeſt through the waters, I will be with thee, that they do not ouerflow thee: when thou walkeſt through the fire, thou ſhalt not be burnt, neither ſhall the flame kindle vpon thee.*[s] *Feare not, for thou ſhalt not be aſhamed, neither ſhalt thou be confounded.*[t] *In righteouſneſſe ſhalt thou be eſtabliſhed, and be farre from feare, for it ſhall*

m Ibid. *Tentatio probat quia non ſunt ex nobis. Quando illius tẽtatio venerit vel ut occaſione veneti volant foras quia grana non erant.*

n Rom. 11. 20.

o Phil. 2. 12.

p Eſa. 35. 4.

q Cap. 41. 10.

r Cap. 43. 1.

s Cap. 54. 4.

t Verſ. 14.

u Verse 17. *shall not come neere thee.* u *This is the heritage of the Lords seruants, whose righteousnesse is of me, saith the Lord.* These gracious and comfortable speeches the Lord vseth to the faithfull, that vnder him they may rest in full assurance of safety, without all feare or doubt, because he promiseth to preuent all those occasions whence any feare or doubt should rise. Whereupon it is that *Zacharie* x Luke.1.74. saith, that x *he hath deliuered vs out of the hands of our enemies to serue* y Heb.2.15. *him without feare,* and Christ is said to haue died y *that hee might deliuer them who for feare of death were all their life time subiect to* z Rom.8.15. *bondage.* And the Apostle S. *Paul* accordingly saith, z *that wee haue* a 2.Tim.1.7. *not receiued the spirit of bondage to feare any more, but the* a *spirit of adoption to cry Abba, Father:* that *God hath not giuen vs the spirit of feare, but of power, and of loue, and of a sound mind.* There is no greater *bondage* then *feare of death,* which representeth to a man nothing but ghastlinesse and horrour, when hee is vncertaine therein what shall become of him. Therefore Christ hath deliuered his from this *bondage of feare,* and that they may rest stablished in the assurance b Luke 12.32. of Saluation, saith vnto them, b *Feare not little flocke; for it is your Fathers pleasure to giue you the kingdome.* The Church of Rome biddeth Christs flocke to stand in feare of their owne Saluation; but Christ the maister of the flocke saith, *Feare not little flocke;* it is *the fathers pleasure to giue you the kingdome.* Thus when he saith c Mat.8.26. to his disciples, c *Why are ye fearefull, O ye of little faith,* and to *Pe-* d Cap.14.31. *ter,* d *O thou of little faith, wherefore didest thou doubt?* hee sheweth that faith importeth an assured beleefe of a mans owne safetie, and forbiddeth *feare and doubt,* as contrarie thereunto. Now therefore when the Scripture commendeth *feare,* it importeth not any such feare as should in the faithfull shake the assurance of Saluation; nay the faithfull man because he findeth in himselfe that *feare,* doth thereby gather the greater assurance to himselfe. It is with euerie e Iob.31.23. faithfull man as it was with *Iob,* e *the punishment of God is fearefull vnto him;* hee dreadeth the iudgements and threatnings which God hath denounced against pride and vnthankfulnesse, against rebellion and contempt of God, knowing assuredly that the same shall be performed, and that God will make it appeare that hee hath not spoken in vaine. Therefore hee abhorreth the courses of the wicked, and walketh not in their waies, but labouring in righteousnes, standeth fully resolued, that God wil saue him from that

destru-

deſtruction that hee hath prouided for them. Neither doth hee dread the ſentence of God onely in reſpect of eternall deſtruction, but alſo in reſpect of temporall plagues and iudgements, wherewith he chaſtneth his owne children, when they behaue themſelues wantonly and vndutifully towards him. In the inflicting whereof God hath regard to make them by the ſmart therof much more to dread his eternal wrath, that they may ceaſe and ſhunne the waies whereby they ſhould bee in danger to incurre the ſame. Now in this ſenſe doth the Apoſtle in the firſt place recommend *feare* to the Churches of the Gentiles, and ſpecially to the Church of Rome, that whereas God had reiected the Iewes, becauſe of their [f] *reiecting the word of God*, and they now *by faith did ſtand*, [t] Acts 13.46. that is, by obedience to the faith and preaching of the Goſpell, had receiued the calling and ſtate of the people of God, & his Church, they ſhould learne by the example of the Iewes to be wiſe and warie for themſelues, trembling at the fearefull wrath that was befallen vpon them, and therefore not flattering themſelues in the opinion of their outward calling as the other before had done, but labouring to do thoſe things which might bee correſpondent to the grace and mercy which God had vouchſafed vnto them. Which if they did neglect, God would [g] *take away his kingdome from them*, as he did from the Iewes, and they ſhould loſe that glorie wherein now they tooke vpon them to reioyce. To the verie ſame purpoſe doth he admoniſh the Corinthians, that the Iſraelites had the ſame calling, & in effect the ſame Sacraments that we haue, and yet when they behaued themſelues vnthankfully & wickedly, God did not forbeare to puniſh them, whereof he had made record in holy Scriptures for example vnto vs; and heereupon concludeth, [h] *Let him that thinketh he ſtandeth, take heed leaſt he fall.* Whereby he giueth to vnderſtand, that outward ſtanding and profeſſing of the faith, without inward grace and feare of God iſſuing into a godly life and conuerſation, is not ſtanding indeed, but ſeeming to ſtand, and therefore that hee that glorieth therein, if he be afraid to fall, muſt lay a better foundation for himſelfe to ſtand vpon. Theſe aduertiſements true faith heareth, and apprehendeth the ſame to make vſe thereof; it is afraid to fall, and therefore ſhunneth that ſecurity and reioycing in outward ſtate wherein they, that applaud themſelues without correſpondencie of inward. [g] Mat. 21.43. [h] 1. Cor. 10.12.

ward affection and godly conuerſation doe meerely delude themſelues. Whereby it commeth to paſſe, that in the publicke deſolations of Churches for the contempt of dutie towards God, yet whoſoeuer hath beleeued the word of God, and feared his iudgement, though lapped in the folds of outward calamities, yet is ſaued from that damnation which hee was fearefull by contempt to runne into. To be ſhort, as a man vpon the top of a high tower is afraid to fall, and trembleth to thinke thereof, when notwithſtanding being enuironed with the battlements, he is without danger of falling, and not afraid that hee ſhall fall: ſo the true beleeuer trembleth with the horrour of the conceit of falling away from God, knowing the end of them to bee moſt vnhappie that ſo doe, when yet hee repoſeth aſſured truſt in God, that being compaſſed about with his protection, and dwelling vnder his defenſe, he himſelfe ſhall bee preſerued for euer. Vnder whoſe defenſe that wee may dwell, there is another *feare* neceſſary, whereby we are drawn away from preſuming of our own ſtrength, that we may be [l]*ſtrong in the Lord* (onely) *and in the power of his might*. And of this *feare* are we to vnderſtand the latter place cited by *M. Biſhop*: [k] *Worke your Saluation in feare and trembling. In feare and trembling*, that is, in humilitie, in due acknowledgement of your owne frailetie, in fearing to bee left to your owne ſelues, in depending wholly vpon God; *For*, ſaith hee, *it is God that worketh in you both to will and to doe*: the adding of which reaſon plainely ſheweth, that *feare and trembling* is to be taken in that meaning as I haue expreſſed. And in that ſort *S. Auſtin* doth expound it: [l] *Therefore doth S. Paul ſay with feare and trembling, leſt attributing to themſelues that they worke well, they ſhould bee proud of their good workes, as if they were their owne: therefore as if one had asked him, why doeſt thou ſay, with feare and trembling, he giueth reaſon of thoſe words, ſaying, For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to doe.* In ſundry [m] other places doth hee expound thoſe words to the ſame effect. So doth *Proſper* alſo ſay, that the Apoſtle by thoſe words [n] *doth admoniſh vs againſt the danger of that pride, whereby a man of a good worke reioiceth in himſelfe rather then in the Lord.* Here is nothing then that the faithfull ſhould ſtand in feare of their owne ſaluation, but onely that they ſhould feare to commit themſelues to themſelues, in working to the accompliſhment of the ſal-

uation

i Epheſ. 6. 10.
k Phil. 2 12.
l *Aug. de grat. & lib. arbit. c. 9. Ideo cum timore & tremore ne ſibi trubuendo quod bene operantur de bonis tanquam ſuis extollantur operibus. Tanquã ergo interrogetur Apoſtolus, & dicatur ei, Quare dixiſti cum timore & tremore, horum verborum rationem reddidit, dicens, Deus eſt enim, &c.*
m *De nat. & grat. ca. 27. De correct. & grat. cap. 9. in Pſal. 65. & 118. conc. 31.*
n *Proſper. apud Ambroſ. ep. 84. Vigilant tentatoris inſidiæ, vt vbi proficit deuotio, ſubrepat elatio, & vt homo de bono opere in ſe potius quàm in Domino glorietur. Sed ſolicitudo nos Apoſtoli contra hoc periculum monet dicentis, Cum timore & tremore, &c.*

uation to which God hath called them, and ſhould remember, that all is to be expected of Gods mercie, whence only it is that either we will or do any thing that is good. Which *feare* is ſo farre from giuing vs cauſe to doubt of Saluation, as that it much rather ſerueth to ſtrengthen the aſſurance thereof, whileſt it maketh vs to reſt onely vpon God, and not vpon our ſelues, knowing that our Saluation dependeth not vpon any thing which we can do for our ſelues, but vpon him *who hath wrought* (and ſo will worke) *all our workes for vs*, and will not leaue that vnperfect which he hath begun. And when ſometimes we forget this *feare*, and incline to truſt in our ſelues, and ſay with *Dauid*, [p] *I ſhall neuer be remoued*, he leaueth vs to the triall of our owne ſtrength, ſo as that wanting his ſupport, wee fall and runne into enormous offenſe, thereby to bee the better inſtructed how little ſafetie wee haue in our owne defenſe, and therefore how neceſſarie it is for vs to depend whollie vpon his grace. Thus the Apoſtle *Peter* preſuming too much of himſelfe, and being left thereupon to himſelfe, fell euen to the denying and abiuring of his maſter Chriſt, that hee in himſelfe and wee in him might learne, that [q] *by his owne might ſhall no man bee ſtrong*, and that euill would our ſtate bee, if our ſafety did not reſt onely and altogether in the Lord. Thus therefore in both places cited by *M. Biſhop*, and in many other we read of *feare*; to *feare* the iudgements and threatnings of God, which the faithfull alwaies doth, becauſe *faith* beleeueth them; to *feare* to truſt in our ſelues, which euerie faithfull man alſo doth, becauſe *faith* it ſelfe importeth truſt in God: but we no where reade any thing whereof to gather that which hee affirmeth, that the faithfull ought *to ſtand in feare of their owne Saluation*. Now therefore his argument is eaſily anſwered; for the *minor propoſition*, which he ſaith is *plainly prooued by the places cited*, is meerely falſe, and hath no proofe at all, either by thoſe places or any other. And how abſurdly doth he abuſe his Reader, that whereas the propoſition by him to bee prooued is not expreſſed in the places alledged, hee notwithſtanding skippeth ouer with meere quoting of them, without ſhewing how the matter to be proued is to be inferred thereof. But ſuch pretie ſhifts doe beſt become the cauſe that he hath in hand. About the *maior propoſition*, whereof there is leſſe queſtion, hee beſtoweth a little paines to little purpoſe: *No man muſt ſtand in feare of that of which by faith he*

[o] Eſa. 26. 12.

[p] Pſal. 30. 6.

[q] 1. Sam. 2. 9.

*he is assured.* Which we grant, as it importeth a dutie, that no man ought to haue any feare of that which he is taught to beleeue, but we deny that which he saith for the prosecutiō or explication therof. For it is false, that there *is no feare in faith*, that is, that there is no faith where there is feare, or feare where there is faith. For whē our
r Mat. 8. 26. & 14. 31. Sauior Christ vpbraideth his disciples with r *fearfulnes & doubting* and yet attributeth vnto them *little faith*, as before is alledged, hee plainely sheweth, that *little faith* is subiect to *feare* and *doubt*, and yet ceaseth not thereupon to be *faith*. He saith that *hee that feareth cannot giue certaine assent*. We answer him, that our *assent* is according to the measure of our faith; *little faith* yeeldeth but weake assent, but yet it is a true assent, whereby wee embrace that whereto we assent. The truth of which faith and assent hereby appeareth euen in feare, because feare causeth it to fall to prayer, which what is it else, but as it were the casting forth of the armes of faith, to catch hold of him in whom it beleeueth, as expecting succour and
s Rom. 10. 14. helpe of him? for s *how shall they call vpon him in whom they haue not beleeued?* Thus the *faith* of the disciples appeared in the places euen now cited, when their *feare* made them to go vnto Christ and say to him, *Master, saue vs*, which they would not haue said, but that they beleeued to haue safety and deliuerance by him. Whereas therfore *M. Bishop* alledgeth the old sayd saw, *Dubius in fide infidelis est, he that is doubtfull in the faith, is an infidell or vnbeleeuer*, we tell him that it is true in him that wholy and absolutely doubteth. But there is a difference to be made betwixt him that absolutely doubteth, and him that weakly assenteth, and in assent is only interrupted with some feare or doubt. For which interruption I trow *M. Bishop* will not say, that the disciples of Christ were *faithlesse*, when Christ himselfe expresly acknowledgeth their *faith*. And thus, by reason the seeds of all impiety lie still hidden in the corruption of our nature, it commeth to passe, that faith sometimes is assaulted with doubts, euen in the maine and principall articles of our beleefe, and out of our owne sinfull condition we question vpon occasion the godhead, the power, the wisedome, the prouidence, the iustice and mercy of almighty God, when yet our faith doth not wholy relinquish the assent thereof. Which though in generality it more seldome come to passe, yet in application of our generall faith to particular occasions, we many times goe halting

halting and lame, and ſtagger ſomewhat at that whereof our faith ſhould giue vs full aſſurance by the word of God. Thus did [t] *Sarah* caſt doubt of Gods promiſe as touching the hauing of a child, who yet is ſaid [u] *through faith to haue receiued ſtrength to conceiue when ſhe was paſt age, becauſe ſhee iudged him faithfull that had promiſed.* Thus did [x] *Moſes* call in queſtion the power of God, as touching prouiding fleſh for the people of Iſrael when he promiſed ſo to do. So [y] *Dauid* and [z] *Habacuk* ſtaggered as touching the prouidence God, and his care of iuſt and righteous men. So I ſhewed before how the diſciples vpon the death of Chriſt were in a mammering concerning the godhead of Chriſt, and the hope of redemption by him which before they had imbraced. Yet we do not thinke, that ſuch doubts and mammerings did in theſe men wholy extinguiſh the light of true faith. In like ſort therefore we alſo reſolue, that the faith whereby we beleeue our owne Saluation, is not by and by ouerthrowne, becauſe ſometimes the aſſurance thereof is ſhaken and interrupted with caſting of feares and doubts. And thus the argument which hee added for ſupplie of thoſe which *M. Perkins* brought, is found to be of as little, indeed leſſe worth then all the reſt, and it well appeareth that *M. Perkins* was better able to ſpeake for *M. Biſhop*, then *M. Biſhop* is able to ſpeake for himſelfe.

t Gen. 18. 12.
u Heb. 11. 11.
x Numb. 11. 21. 22.
y Pſal. 73. 2. 3.
z Habac. 1. 2. 13.

## IF. W. BISHOP.

*To theſe inuincible reaſons grounded vpon Gods word, let vs ioyne ſome plaine teſtimonies, taken as well out of the holy Scripture, as out of the ancient Fathers. Firſt, what can be more manifeſt to warrant vs, that the faithfull haue not aſſurance infallible of their Saluation, then theſe words of the holy Ghoſt:* There be iuſt (*and therfore faithfull*) and wiſe men, and their works be in the hand of God, and neuertheleſſe a mã doth not know whether he be worthy of hatred or loue, but all things are kept vncertaine for the time to come. *Where is then the Proteſtants certaintie? And becauſe one heretike cauilleth againſt the Latine tranſlation ſaying, that a word or two of it may bee otherwiſe turned, heare how* S. Ierome, *who was moſt cunning in the Hebrew text, doth vnderſtand it. The ſence is* (*ſaith he*) I haue found the works of the iuſt men, to be in the hand of God, and yet themſelues not to know, whether they be loued of God or no.

Eccleſ. 9.

Comment. in hunc locum.

R. AB-

R. ABBOT.

To his former *inuisible* reasons, we shall haue now some further testimonies adioyning, that make as little for him as his reasons haue done. And first he alledgeth a place of *Saloman*, *A man doth not know whether he be worthie of hatred or loue, but all things are kept vncertaine for the time to come.* But he knew well that the translation of this place might iustly be excepted against, which indeed is very false. He saith that *one heretike* cauilleth against it; but neither is hee one onely, nor an heretike, neither doth hee cauill, but iustly reiecteth it by warrant of the originall text, so as that *M. Bishops* owne friends doe translate the words farre otherwise then he alledgeth them. The Hebrew word for word according to the Septuagint translated by *Hierome*, is thus; [a] *Also loue, also hatred, a man knoweth not all in the face of them.* The obscurity of which words hath caused men very diuersly to conceiue of the true meaning thereof. One construction is made by *Olympiodorus*, that [b] *he that yet fauoureth the things of man, and hath not sincerely giuen himselfe to God, knoweth not what things are worthie to be loued, and what to be hated.* Another exposition hee alledgeth taken from the translation of *Symmachus*; [c] *A man knoweth not whether vpon some change he shall find him louing or kind whom hē now hateth, or shall haue cause to be afraid of him whom hee now loueth.* With least mutation or change we translate the words thus, *A man knoweth not loue or hatred* (that is, who is loued or hated) *by all that is before them*, and then the meaning is plaine; that by outward things, by the things that are before our face, a man knoweth not whether he be beloued or hated of God; wherof the reasō followeth, *because all things come alike to all, and there is the same condition (outwardly) to the iust and to the wicked &c.* And to this effect the translation of *Symmachus* tendeth, though *Olympiodorus* gathered otherwise thereof. [d] *Moreouer a man knoweth not loue or hatred, but all things are vncertaine before them, because the like things befall to all, both to iust and vniust.* Which translation as *Hierome* approueth, so he confirmeth also the meaning of it, saying, [e] *Where as he saith that there is the same condition to all, he meaneth it of affliction or death, and that therefore men know not the loue of God or his hatred towards them.*

And

a Eccles.9.1. *Et quidem charitatis & quidem odium nō est cognoscens homo omnia in facie eorū.* Hieron.

b *Olympiod. in Eccles. ca.9. Qui adhuc sapit quæ hominis sunt neque plenè Deo se tradidit, nescit discretio iudicio quæ dilectione sūt digna quæ odio.*

c *Ibid. Nescit homo si quem nunc maximè odit, mutatis vicibus amicū & beneficū sit experturus, cōtraque an timendum sibi quandoque sit ab eo quem nunc amore prosequitur.* d *Symmac. apud Hieron. in Eccl. cap.9. Insuper neque amicitias neque inimicitias scit homo, sed omnia coram eis incerta, propterea quod omnibus eueniunt similia iusto & iniusto.*

e *Hieron ibid. Quod autem ait, Euentus est vnus omnibus iusto & impio, siue angustiarum siue mortis significat euentū, & idcirco nec charitatem Dei eos in se nosse nec odium.*

And thus indeed true it is as *M. Bishop* citeth out of *Hierome*, that a man cannot esteeme by any outward state whether he be loued or hated of God; for neither doe the righteous onely prosper, neither are the wicked only crossed and afflicted, but the wicked flourish many times more gloriously then the iust, & the hand of God often lieth heauier vpon the iust then vpon the wicked & vngodly, and both are subiect to death, both are laied in the graue, without any appearance or shew of difference betwixt the one & the other. But this maketh nothing against vs; for although by the eye the beleeuer cannot discerne the loue of God towards himselfe, yet that hindereth not but that by faith he apprehendeth and embraceth the same. And thus *S. Bernard* excepteth against that place, being so translated as *M. Bishop* readeth it. [f] *Being sure of Gods ableneſſe to saue vs, how do we to be assured of his willshereto? for who knoweth whether he be worthie of loue or hatred? who hath knowne the mind of the Lord, or hath bene his counsellor? But here faith must helpe vs; here Gods truth must be our succour, that that which lieth hidden concerning vs in the heart of God our father, may by his spirit be reuealed vnto vs, and his spirit by the testimonie thereof may perswade our spirit that we are the children of God, and that by calling and iustifying vs freely by faith.* Thus though we take the place translated as *M. Bishop* alledgeth it, yet by *S. Bernards* iudgement it auaileth him nothing, because albeit otherwise we cannot know whether wee bee beloued or hated of God, yet by faith & by the spirit of God, that secret is reuealed vnto vs, that we are the children of God and beloued of him. Onely that we take that *worthineſſe of the loue of God*, to be meant of Gods acceptation and vouchsafing to thinke vs worthie, because otherwise the place so translated soundeth a manifest vntruth and contrary to the Scripture. For if we speake simply of worthinesse, who doth not know himselfe *worthy of hatred*; what faithfull man doth not say as *Daniel* said, [g] *To thee O Lord belongeth righteousneſſe, but vnto vs* (reckoning himselfe for one) *belongeth confusion of face. Dauid* saith, [h] *Enter not into iudgement with thy seruant, O Lord, for in thy sight no man liuing shall be iustified.* [i] *If thou straitly marke what is done amisse, who shall bee able to stand?* It is false then to say that a man knoweth not whether he be *worthie of loue or hatred*, for hee knoweth or should know himselfe worthie to be hated, but yet by faith a man beleeueth himselfe in

f *Bernard in dedic. eccles. ser. 5. Sed de possibilitate iam certi de voluntate quid agimus? Quis scit si est dignus amore an odio? Quis nouit sensum Domini, aut quis consiliarius eius fuit? Hoc iam planè fidem nobis subuenire necesse est, hic oportet succurrere veritatem vt quod de nobis latet in corde patris nobis per ipsum spiritum reuelet ur & spiritus eius testificans persuadeat spiritui nostro quod filij Dei simus.*

g Dan. 9. 7.

h Psal. 143. 2.

i 130. 3.

Christ to be beloued, though he know, that in himselfe hee worthily deserueth to be hated. And so *S. Bernard* againe saith of the faithfull, [k] *A vile worme worthy of euerlasting hatred, yet is confidently perswaded that he is beloued, because he feeleth himself to loue.* Thus *S. Bernard* both waies contraieth M. *Bishop*, affirming that the faithfull man knoweth himselfe worthy to be hated, and yet by faith confidently presumeth that he is beloued of God. As yet therfore we haue no proofe that the faithfull man ought to stand in feare of his owne saluation.

[k] *Bernard. epist. 107. Supra sect. 3.*

## 12. W. Bisop.

*Another plaine testimony is taken out of* S. Paul, *where hee sheweth that it is not in vs to iudge of our owne iustice, but we must leaue to God the iudgement of it, these be the words:* I am not guilty in conscience of any thing, but I am not iustified herein, but he that iudgeth me is our Lord, therefore iudge not before the time vntil our Lord do come, who also will lighten the hidden things of darknes and will manifest the counsell of the heart, and then the praise shal be to euery man of God. *So that before Gods iudgement by* S. Pauls *testimony, men may not assure themselues of their owne iustice, much lesse of their Saluation, how innocent soeuer they find themselues in their own consciences. See vpon this place* S. Ambrose, S. Basil, Theodoret *on this place, who all agree, that men may haue secret faults, which God onely seeth, and therefore they must liue in feare, and alwaies pray to bee deliuered from them. For the rest, let* S. Augustines *testimony (whom our aduersaries acknowledge to be the most diligent and faithfull register of all antiquitie) be sufficient. This most iudicious, and holy Father thus defineth this matter:* As long as we liue here, we our selues cannot iudge of our selues, I doe not say what we shall be to morrow, but what we are to day. *And yet more directly:* Albeit holy men are certaine of the reward of their perseuerance: yet of their owne perseuerance, they are found vncertaine. For what man can know that he shall perseuer, and hold on in the action & increase of iustice vntill the end, vnles, by some reuelation he be assured of it from him, who of his iust, but secret iudgement doth not inform all men of this matter, but deceiueth none: *So no iust man is assured of his Saluation by his ordinary faith: by extraordinary reuelation,*

1. Cor. 4.

*Serm. 5. in Psa. 118. De constitut. monast. cap. 2.*

*De verb. Domini. serm. 35. De ciuit. Dei lib. 21. cap. 12.*

some

*some men may be assured, the rest are not. Which is iust the Catholicks sentence. And because S.* Bernard *is by our aduersaries cited for them in this point, take his testimony in as precise termes as any Catholicke at this time speaketh. Thus he writeth:* Who can say, I am one of the elect, I am one of the predestinate to life, I am one of the number of the children? Who (*I say*) can thus say, the Scripture crying out against him: A man knoweth not, whether he bee worthy of loue or hatred? Therfore we haue no certainety, but the confidence of hope doth comfort vs, that wee bee not vexed at all with the perplexity of this doubt. *The word of God (according to S.* Bernard) *crieth out against all them, that certainely assure themselues of their Saluation: whereon then doe they build their faith that beleeue it?*

*Serm. 1. de Septuag.*

Eccles. 9.

R. ABBOT.

The summe of his argument in this place is, that we are vncertaine of our owne righteousnesse, and therefore can haue no certainety of our owne Saluation. To proue the vncertainty of our righteousnesse, he alledgeth the words of the Apostle, [a] *I am not guilty to my selfe in any thing, yet am I not therein iustified.* Where it is worth the noting, that whereas the Apostle saith by expresse negatiue, *I am not iustified therby*, he maketh as if the Apostle had meant I cannot tel whether I be iustified or not. It may be I am iust, it may be I am not iust. If I be, my iustice shall merit heauen: If I be not, I know not what may aptly become of me. But the Apostle neuer made any such doubt; he well knew, that the clerenesse of his conscience was not it that could yeeld him iustification before God. He knew it to be true which S. *Austin* saith, that [b] *according to the most entire rule of Gods truth, no man liuing shall bee found iust in the sight of God*, and therefore professeth that [c] *hee accounteth all things but losse for the excellent knowledge of Christ Iesus our Lord, for whom* saith he, *I haue counted all things losse, and doe iudge them to be dung, that I might winne Christ, and might bee found in him, not hauing mine owne righteousnesse, which is by the law, but the righteousnesse which is by the faith of Christ, euen the righteousnes which is of God by faith.* Here is then a renouncing of his own righteousnesse, and an acknowledgement of iustification and righteousnes onely by faith in Christ. A notable fruit of which faith it was so to walk, as

a 1 Cor. 4. 4. Of this place see further the fourth Section of the next question, concerning Iustification.

b *August. de pec. cat. mer. & remiss. lib. 2. cap. 19. Quantum ad integerrimam regulam veritatis eius pertinet, non iustificabitur, &c.*

c Phil. 3. 8.

that he could say, *I am not guilty to my selfe in any thing*, in which sort he speaketh else where,[d] *This is our reioycing, euen the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly pureneſſe, not by carnal wisedome, but by the grace of God, we haue had our conuerſation in the world.* Of which testimony of conscience S. *Iohn* saith,[e] *If our heart condemne vs not (but that we are of the truth) then haue we boldneſſe towards God, and shall before him assure our hearts.* Whereby we are taught, that to walk with a good conscience in the faith of Christ, ministreth great boldnes and assurance towards God, and therefore that the Apostle in the place cited protesting the innocency of his conscience, was far from professing to stand in doubt of his own Saluation, yea, and were not *M. Bishop* a man of an iron face, he would not attribute to the Apostle any such doubt. For the true vnderstanding of the place we are to obserue, as appeareth by the processe of this Epistle, that there were diuisions and part-takings amongst the Corinthians, some magnifying one of their teachers, and some another, and they willingly accepting the applause and praises of their followers, and each thinking highly of himselfe aboue the rest. Now the Apostle vnder his owne name, and the names of *Apollo* and *Cephas*, instructeth those teachers against this vain affectation of human applause: he wisheth thē to be content to be reckoned each with other the Ministers of Christ, & therein to haue a care to deale faithfully towards him whose stewards they are, endeauouring to their vttermost to please the Lord, not thinking the better of themselues for that men magnifie them aboue others, becaus men know thē not, nor can duly esteem of thē. Nay how should other iudge of vs, when we cannot sufficiently iudge of our selues, who in our greatest innocency as seemeth vs, yet cānot iustifie our selues to God, & when to our selues we are guilty of nothing, yet with him are found guilty many waies; becauſe he seeth in vs that that we see not in our selues, & espieth iniquities and defaults where we by our sight can descry none, so that to his sight haply they are found superiours to vs, whom we think to be our inferiors: & they are approued for the better, whō mēs iudgements take to be the worse, & therfore reiecting the vainglorious cōmendatiōs of partially affected mē, we are to refer our selus wholy to the iudgment of the Lord. And thus are those words expounded by those very authors whō *M. Bishop* citeth, not that mē *may haue se-*

[d] 2. Cor. 1. 12.

[e] 1. Ioh. 3. 19. 21.

ecret faults, which perhaps may hinder their being iuſt, but that he beſt haue ſecret faults at leaſt, by reaſon whereof in themſelues they are not iuſt. Thus *Ambroſe* taketh it; [f] *The Apoſtle was not to himſelfe guilty of default, but becauſe he was a man, he confeſſed himſelfe a ſinner, knowing that Ieſus onely is the true light who did no ſinne, neither was there guile found in his mouth, and that he onely is found iuſt, who was indeed free from falling.* The words of *Theodoret* are not ſo plaine, but *Baſil* euidently maketh the Apoſtle to ſay; [g] *I offend in many things which I know not, as it is writte, who knoweth how oft he offendeth? For although we ſinne many waies, yet we do not know (or we are not ware) of many of our ſinnes.* The Apoſtles words then import not a doubt, but an abſolute deniall of his being iuſt, euen by the teſtimonie of *M. Biſhops* owne records. And this ſhall further appeare in the next queſtion, vpon further examination of the ſame words. *M. Biſhop* therefore muſt change his antecedent propoſition, and not ſay, We are vncertaine of our owne iuſtice or righteouſneſſe, but rather, Wee are certaine and ſure, that in our ſelues we are not iuſt. And if hereof he will conclude, that we muſt therefore doubt of our owne Saluation, wee muſt tell him that his argument holdeth not. Indeed if our ſaluation were to ſtand vpon our owne righteouſneſſe, wee were not onely to doubt, but wholly to deſpaire of our owne Saluation; becauſe by inherent iuſtice, as ſhall be ſhewed, no man ſhall bee iuſtified in Gods ſight. Euen in our greateſt perfection, when wee looke vnto our ſelues and our owne righteouſneſſe, we are ſubiect to that amaſed diſtraction which the Apoſtle deſcribeth, euen to ſay, [h] *Who ſhall aſcend into heauen?* as if Chriſt were not aſcended to make way for vs: and *Who ſhall deſcend into the deepe?* as if Chriſt had not died to deliuer vs from thence: we can neuer ſatisfie our ſelues, how either to eſcape the one, or to attaine the other. Therefore we according to the promiſe of the Goſpell, reſt the aſſurance of Saluation vpon faith in Chriſt, fully beleeuing that his merit is our righteouſneſſe, and that by the vertue thereof we are accepted vnto eternall life. Which ſith *M. Biſhop* knew well enough, it was but an idle vagarie of his, to alledge this ſo impertinently for an argument againſt vs. Now as touching the teſtimonies that he further alledgeth, the firſt of them is nothing to the matter in hand, to ſay nothing that hee quoteth it from a place where it is not found, and where it is found

[f] *Ambroſ. in Pſal. 118. ſer. 5. Delictis ſuis non erat ſibi non rat. ſed quia homo erat peccatorē ſe fatebatur, ſciens vnū eſſe Ieſum lumen verum qui peccatum non facit, &c. ipſum ſolum iuſtificari qui verè à ſenſus eſſet à lapſu.*

[g] *Baſil. in Conſtit. monaſt. cap 2. Hoc eſt, multa pecco quæ non intelligo; vnde & Propheta dixit, Delicta quis intelligit? &c. Licet multa peccamus, plura tamen delictorum noſtrorum ignoramus.*

[h] Rom. 10, 6.

is not *Auſtins*, though it be in an homily amongſt his. The Author of thoſe words ſpeaketh to the ſame purpoſe as the Apoſtle did, to diſſwade from taking delight in the praiſes and commendations of men, becauſe they cannot know what commendation ſhould be due vnto vs. Yea ſaith he, [i] *So long as we liue here, we our ſelues cannot iudge of our ſelues, I ſay not what we ſhall be to morrow, but what we are to day: how much leſſe then ſhould we be moued with other mens iudgements then with our owne conſcience, which giueth teſtimony vnto vs? for our conſcience ſhould be our glory.* We are not then vpon other mens opinions of vs to ſwell in opinion of our ſelues; we do not for the preſent ſufficiently conceiue our owne imperfections and defaults, which with God may detract from vs much of that which men attribute vnto vs; we know not whether God may ſuffer vs to fall, as he doth many times his deareſt children, to ſtaine that commendation and vaine glory that we take too great pleaſure in: but all this hindereth nothing but that faith is aſſured by the word of God, that God will neuer ſuffer it ſo to faile, or vs ſo to fall, as to fall vtterly away from him. The other place of *Auſtin* ſpeaketh indefinitely of all, who [k] *to our ſight liue iuſtly and godlily, with hope of future immortality, who though they be (all) ſure that there is a reward of perſeuerance, yet are not (all) ſure to perſeuere*, becauſe all are not indeed the ſame that to our ſight they ſeeme to be. Onely they are aſſured thereof, as he ſaith, [l] *whom God aſſureth by reuelation from him*; who doth reueale it by faith, through the ſpirit in our vocation and iuſtification, as we haue heard before out of S *Bernards* words. The ſame *S. Auſtin* ſaith to his hearers; [m] *If there be in you faith, which worketh by loue, euen now ye belong to them that are predeſtinated, called, iuſtified* Now ſith the faithful by *S. Auſtins* iudgement do belõg to them that are predeſtinated, called, iuſtified, it followeth by *S. Auſtins* iudgement, that they are to be aſſured that they belong to them that ſhal be glorified, and therefore ſhal certainly perſeuer, becauſe [n] *whom God hath predeſtinated, called, iuſtified, them he hath glorified*, as the Apoſtle ſaith. And therefore doth S. *Auſtin* will the faithfull man [o] *to beleeue that he ſhall liue for euer*, as before was ſhewed, and if he muſt beleeue to liue for euer, he muſt beleeue alſo to perſeuer, not doubting thereof, becauſe what Chriſt ſaith in the Goſpell to one, belongeth to euery one, [p] *According to thy faith, ſo be it vnto thee.* Such is then the certainty and aſſurance that we teach, not as commonly

i *Auguſt. homil.* 35. *Quamdiu viuimus hic, de noſtris ſi noſtipſi iudicare non poſſumus, non dico quod cras erimus ſed quod hodie ſimus. Quanto minus debemus mouere iudicijs alienis quam de conſcientia noſtra quæ nobi perhibet teſtimonium? Nam gloria noſtra debet eſſe conſcientia noſtra.*

k *Aug. de ciuit. Dei lib* 11. *cap.* 12. *Quos uidemus iuſtè ac piè cum ſpe futuræ immortali atis hanc uitam ducere, &c. Licet de ſuæ perſeuerantiæ præm.o certi ſint de ipſa tamen perſeuerantia ſua reperiuntur incerti, &c.*

l *Quis ſciat, &c. n ſi aliqua reuelatione ab illo fiat certus qui de hac re iuſto latentiq; iudicio non omnes inſtruit ſed nemnem falſit.*

m *De uer. Apoſt. ſer.* 16. *Fides quæ per dilectionem operatur ſi eſt in uobis, iam pertinet is adpræſtina os, uocato, iuſtificatos.*

n Rom. 8. 30.

o *Auguſt. n Pſal.* 148. *Supra Sect.* 3.

p *Mat.* 9. 29.

monly we vnderſtand certainty and aſſurance by ſenſe or by reaſon, by euidence and plaine appearance, wherby directly and immediatly we know the thing whereof we are aſſured (this certainty and aſſurance *S. Auſtin* denieth, and ſo do we) but an aſſurance of faith, wherby by ſignes & arguments we beleeue by the word and promiſe of God, that ſo it ſhall be, & reſt aſſured that ſo it ſhall be, becauſe we do beleeue. And this is ordinary faith, wherby God ordinarily in ſome meaſure reuealeth the ſecret of his election to the faithfull. Neither is there any neceſſity to reſtraine *S. Auſtines* words to extraordinary reuelation, as *M. Biſhop* doth. That former certainty *S. Bernard* alſo denieth in the words alleged by *M. Biſhop*, but we haue before ſeene how he auoucheth the certainty of faith againſt the words cited in the place here alleged, *A man knoweth not whether he be worthy of loue or of hatred.* No man by any apprehenſion or light of fleſh and bloud can ſay, I am one of the elect, I am one of the predeſtinate: no man by iudgement of reaſon or humane knowledge can conceiue it, but yet as he ſaith in the very place here cited, [q] *there are certain manifeſt ſignes & tokens of ſaluation, ſuch as that it is without all doubt that he is of the number of the elect, in whom thoſe tokens do remain.* Of which ſignes he ſpeaketh thus in another place: [r] *How ſhould God leaue his elect without teſtimony (of their election?) or what comfort might there be vnto them wauing carefully betwixt hope and feare, if they did not find the fauour to haue ſome teſtimonie therof? The Lord knoweth who are his, he only knoweth whom he hath choſen from the beginning: but what man knoweth if he be worthy of loue or hatred? But if, as certaine it is, that certainty be denied vnto vs* (in ſuch ſort as before was ſaid) *how much the more delightfull ſhall they be, if wee can find any tokens of this election? For what reſt can our ſoule haue, ſo long as it hath yet no teſtimonie of it owne predeſtination? Therefore it is a word to be beleeued, and worthie by all meanes to be receiued, whereby the witneſſe and teſtimonie of our ſaluation is commended vnto vs.* Thus hee denieth that abſolute certaintie that before I mentioned, but denieth not that certaintie of faith which is gathered from ſuch ſignes and tokens as by the word of God are deliuered vnto vs, which he giueth to vnderſtand is ſuch as whereby we are kept from that *wauing and wauering betwixt hope and feare*, which *M. Biſhop* requireth to take place in euery faithfull man. And this certainty is

q *Bernard. in ſeptuag. ſer. 1. Data ſunt ſigna quædam & notitiæ manifeſtæ ſalutis vt indubitabile ſit eum eſſe de numero electorum in quo ea ſigna permanſerint.*

r *Idem in octauam Paſcha. ſer. 2. Quomodo ſine teſtimonio electos ſuos diligeret Deus? aut certè quenam eis eſſe poterat conſolatio inter ſpem & metum ſolicitudine anxia fluctuantibus ſi nullum omnino electionis ſuæ teſtimonium habere mereretur? Nouit Dominus qui ſunt eius, & ſolus ipſe ſcit quos elegerit à priuc pio. Quis verò ſcit hominū ſi eſt dignus amore vel odio? Quod ſi vt certiū eſt certitudo nobis omnino negatur, nunquid non tanto delectabiliora erunt ſi qua ſortè electionis huius ſigna reperiri poſſint inuenire? Quam enim requiem habere poteſt ſpiritus noſter diuini prædeſtinationis ſuæ nullum adhuc teſtimonium tenens? fideliſ proinde ſermo & omni acceptione dignus quo ſaluationis teſtimonia commendantur.*

such as that *Bernard* himselfe thus expresseth it in himselfe: [1] *There are three things which do so strengthen and stablish my heart, as that no want of merits, no consideration of mine owne vilenesse, no estimation of the heauenly blisse, can cast me downe from the height of my hope, being fast rooted therein; I consider three things, I say, in which my hope wholly consisteth: the loue of God in adopting mee, the truth of his promise, and his power to performe the same. Let my foolish thought now repine and murmure as much as it will, saying, Who art thou, and how great is that glorie, and by what merits doest thou hope to obtaine the same? And I will boldly answer, I know whom I haue beleeued, and I am certaine or sure, because hee hath adopted mee in great loue, because he is true in his promise, because hee is of power to make good the same.* Thus Saint *Bernard* expresly affirmeth a certainty of faith, and speaketh so like a Protestant, as that if he were now aliue, hee should at Rome bee condemned for an hereticke as well as wee. Hee was not of the mind that *M. Bishop* saith, that *the word of God crieth out against them that by faith* take assurance of their saluation, but only denieth that there is any assurance of saluation to be taken from our owne immediate and absolute knowledge and apprehension thereof, which we also confesse as well as he.

[1] Idem de Euang. sic pauim. ser. 3. Tria sunt quæ sic roborant & confirmant cor meum, vt nulla me penuria meritorum, nulla consideratio propriæ vilitatis, nulla æstimatio cœlestis beatitudinis ab altitudine spei deijcere possit in ea firmiter radicatum, &c. Tria considero in quibus tota spes mea consistit, charitatem adoptionis, veritatem promissionis, potestatem redditionis. Murmuret iam quantum voluerit insipiens cogitatio mea, dicens, Quis enim es tu, aut quanta est illa gloria, quibus tua meritis hanc obtinere speras? Et ego fiducialiter respondeo, scio cui credidi, & certus sum quia in charitate nimia adoptauit me, quia verax in promissione, quia potens in exhibitione, &c.

## 7. W. Bishop.

*If it may be permitted to ioyne moderne opinions with ancient, badde men with good, I could proue by the testimony of euery principall sect of this time, that all other sectaries were deceiued in this their perswasion of their saluation. For both Lutherans, Caluinists, and Anabaptists (to omit the rest) do hold euery one of themselues assured of their saluation, and yet each sect holdeth euery one not of his owne band assured of damnation: so that by the sentence of the Lutherans, all Caluinists, and Anabaptists, are miserably deceiued when they assure themselues of their saluation: In like maner, if the Anabaptists be true censurers, both Lutherans, and Caluinists, and all other, not of their heresy, erre foulie, when they beare themselues in hand that they shall be saued. Certaine it is therefore by the consent of all the world, that very many who assure themselues of saluation, are indeed assured of damnation.*

R. An-

R. Abbot.

*A fooles bolt is soone shot. Bad men*, saith he, *with good:* but of all those *bad men* are there any so bad as he & his fellow Seculars haue described the Iesuites to be, and the Iesuites them? Let vs turn the argument then vpon themselues: The Secular Priests hope for saluation, yet the Iesuites hold them for proud men, contentious, irregular, scandalous, and in a word for schismatikes, and therefore in case of damnation. So the Iesuites hope for saluation; yet the Seculars, though being brought in case to leap at a cruſt, they now dissemble it, hold them for very villaines, the notable impostors and cosiners of the world, for very rakehels and diuels incarnate, for heretikes, and what not? Thus *M. Bishop* hath been conceited: thus hath *Watson* in his *Quodlibets* discouered them, and thereby to be assured ly in state of damnation also. Their grounds therfore on both sides are false, whereby they conceiue any hope of saluation. Yea, & in the body of their vnity amongst their Popes, their Cardinals, their Bishops, and the rest, there are many who vpon false grounds do hope for Saluation. Is it an argument therefore that they haue no true grounds, wherupon to build the hope therof? The Turks hope for saluation by their superstitions, the Iewes hope for saluation by their traditions, and both take the Papists to be damned; and wil *M Bishop* take this to be any impeachment of their hope? So therfore although Papists & Anabaptists, and such other absurd heretikes do think the faithfull to be in state of damnation, yet this nothing hindreth, but that the faithful themselues, vpon the grounds that God hath laid before them, should stand assured of saluation. As for that which he saith of *Lutherans* and *Caluinists*, it is but the casting of his gall, the bitternes wherof remaineth only to himselfe. We ioy not in any such titles, nor loue to diuide our selues as Popish Monkes and Friars do, by the names of men. And in that difference of opinions that is betwixt them that are so called, there is none that is soberly minded, that doth preiudicate the others hope towards God, but rather by vnitie of faith in the maine, learneth of the Apostle to say, * *If any bee otherwise minded* (then he ought) *God will euen reueale the same vnto him.* There may be difference of opinions betwixt good men, as it

* Phil 3.15.

fell

fell out of old betwixt *Cyprian* and *Stephanus* Bishop of Rome, betwixt *Hierome* and *Austine*, betwixt *Chrysostome* and *Epiphanius*, and sundry others, yea and the same may grow to some egernesse and anger whilest each maintaineth his owne conceit. But *S Austines* rule ought to be remembred: [b] *There may be brauls, as there haue been sometimes betwixt brethren, betwixt Saints and holy men, as betwixt* Barnabas *and* Paul, *but not to breake concord of heart, not to destroy charity and loue.* Which rule so long as we retaine, and doe [c] *follow the truth in loue*, as the Apostle exhorteth, God doth pardon our error, and will in his good time bring our darknes into light, that in the end [d] *wee may all meet together in the vnitie of faith and knowledge of the sonne of God*, to be [e] *of one mind and of one iudgement*, which we all ought to striue vnto. This mind *Cyprian* bare in his priuate opinion of rebaptrizing, saying to them that were assembled in counsell with him, [f] *Let vs euery man deliuer what we thinke of this matter, iudging no man, nor seuering any man from the right of our communion for being minded otherwise.* With this mind *Austine* said to *Hierome*, [g] *If it may be that wee may search or reason betwixt vs any matter, whereby without bitternesse of discord our hearts may be fed, let vs so doe. But if I cannot say what I thinke is to bee amended in thy writings, or thou in mine, without suspition of enuie, and breach of friendship, let vs giue ouer these matters, and fauour our owne life and saluation. Let knowledge which puffeth vp haue the lesse, that there may be no offense to loue which edifieth.* They who in the profession of one true religion, doe prosecute their differences with other minde, doe bewray their owne corruption, and breake that [h] *vnitie of the spirit*, that should be preserued *by the bond of peace.* Seeing therefore we beare this mind in some difference of opinions, it is nothing else but *M. Bishops* malice to inferre thereof, that we each to other denie the hope or assurance of saluation. But his conclusion of al this babblement is a wise one, *Certaine it is therefore that very many who assure themselues of saluation, are indeed assured of damnation.* For what is it to the question, if any by carnal security dreaming of saluation, haue in the end failed of that, which rashly and without ground they haue presumed of? we doubt not but many presumptuous hypocrits & heretiks come to nought, who for the time by vain opinion haue flattered themselues in the false hope of that which they neuer imbraced by true faith: but the fail

b *August. in Psal. 33. Non possunt iusti existere rixæ aliquæ quomodo inter fratres & inter sanctos exorirentur inter Barnabam & Paulum, sed non quæ occiderent: cordiam, non quæ interimerent charitatẽ.*
c Ephes. 4. 15.
d Vers. 13.
e 1. Cor. 1. 10.
f *Cyprian. in concil. Carthag. De hac ipsa re quid singuli sentiamus proferamus, neminem iudicantes nec a iure cõmunionis aliquem si diuersum sensserit amouentes.*
g *August. Epist. 15. Si fieri potest vt inter nos quæramus & disseramus aliquid quo sine amaritudine discordiæ corda nostra pascantur, fiat. Si autem non possumus dicere quid mihi emendandum videatur in scriptis tuis, nec tu meis sine suspicione inuidiæ aut læsione amicitiæ, quiescamus ab his & nostræ vitæ saluti parcamus. Minus enim offenditur in ea quæ inflat, dum non offenditur illa quæ ædificat.*
h Ephes. 4. 3.

fall of them in whom there neuer was any true faith, no whit impeacheth the assurance of them, who truly and vnfainedly do beleeue.

## 14. W. BISHOP.

*With the testimonies of the antient Doctors for vs, I pray thee gentle Reader, conferre those which* M. Perkins *in his sixth reason alledgeth against vs. First*, S. Augustine *in these words:* Of an euill seruant, thou art made a good child: therefore presume not of thine owne doing, but of the grace of Christ. It is no arrogancy, but faith to acknowledge, what thou hast receiued, it is not pride, but deuotion. *What word is here of Certainty of Saluation? but that it belongeth to a faithfull man, to confesse himselfe much bound to God, for calling of him to be his. Which euery Christian must do, hoping himselfe so to be, and being most certaine, that if he be not in state of grace, it is long of himselfe, & no want on Gods part. The second place hath not so much as any shew of words for him, thus he speaketh:* Let no man aske another man, but returne to his owne heart, and if he finde Charity there, he hath security for his passage, from life to death *What need was there to seeke charity in his heart, for security of his Saluation, if his faith assured him thereof, therefore this text maketh flat against him.*

Pag. 57. *De verb. Domini ser. 28.* *Tract. 5. in Epist. Ioan.*

## R. ABBOT.

Tho words of *Austine*, or rather of *Ambrose* (for he indeed is the author of them) are these, [a] *O man, thou didst not dare to lift thine eies to heauen; thou didst cast them to the earth, and vpon the sudden thou receiuedst the grace of Christ: all thy sinnes are forgiuen thee. Of an euill seruant thou art made a good sonne. Presume therefore not of thine owne working, but of the grace of Christ. For by grace ye are saued saith the Apostle. Here therefore is no arrogancy, but faith. to speake of that which thou hast receiued, is not pride, but deuotion.* To which words Master *Bishop* answereth, *What word is here of Certainty of Saluation*, when as expressly against his assertion it is affirmed, that the faithfull regenerate in Christ, doth *presume*, that *his sinnes are forgiuen him, that hee hath receiued the grace of Christ, that hee is made the child of God*, and that this is no *arrogancie*, no *pride*, no vnlawfull presumption, but a matter of *faith*, a matter of *deuotion*, and *a good presumption*, as he calleth it afterwards. Now all these

[a] *Augustin. de verb. Dom. ser. 28. ex Ambros. de sacram. lib. 5. cap. 4. O homo nō audebas oculos tuos ad cœlum attollere. oculos tuos ad terram dirigebas & subito accepisti gratiam Christi. Omnia tibi peccata dimissa sunt. Ex malo seruo factus es bonus filius. Ideo ne presume non de operatione tua sed de Christi gratia. Gratia enim saluati estis, Apostolus ait. Non ergo hic arrogantia est sed fides, prædicare quod accepisti non est superbia sed deuotio.*

things

things he comprehendeth vnder the name of *Saluation*, citing to that purpose the words of the Apostles, *By grace ye are saued*. For how doth the Apostle say, *By grace yee are saued*, as of a thing done already, but for that we are made partakers of the forgiuenesse of sinnes, haue receiued the grace of Christ, and are become the children of God? Therefore in presuming of these things, as *Ambrose* willeth the faithfull to do, we consequently presume, and stand assured of our owne Saluation, because in these things our Saluation is begun, as appeareth by the words of Christ concerning *Zacheus*:

b Luc. 19.9. b *This day saluation is come to this house, because this man is become the sonne of Abraham.* And whereas *M. Bishop* saith, we may not presume hereof, because *we know not our owne works or righteousnesse*, *S. Ambrose* telleth vs, that this is not to be presumed *of our own works, but of the grace of Christ*, the true *calling* whereof is such, as maketh vs that whereunto we are called, because we are thereby called, not at the eare only, but inwardly, and in the heart. Therefore them that are thus truly called, *S. Ambrose* willeth not coldly to hope, according to the manner of *M. Bishops* hope, where feare is as strong as hope, but faithfully and deuoutly to presume that they are in the state of grace; not with doubting to thinke, that *if they bee not so, it is long of themselues*, but to resolue that without themselues they are so indeed, onely by the grace of God. We may well thinke that it was a frosty morning, that made *M Bishop* to make so cold construction of so effectuall and plaine words. But in the next place cited out of *Austine*, he goeth beyond himselfe. Let vs take the whole words as he hath them, vpon these words of *S. Iohn*;

c 1.Ioh.3.14. d *Augustin. Ioan. tract. 5 Quid nos scimus? Quia transiuimus de morte ad vitam. vnde scimus? Quia diligimus fratres. Nemo interroget hominem: redeat vnusquisque ad cor suum. Si ibi inuenerit charitatem fraternam securus sit, quia transijt de morte ad vitam. Iam in dextra est. Non attendat quia modo gloria eius occulta est: cum venerit Dominus tunc apparebit gloria eius. Viget enim sed adhuc in hyeme: viget radix, sed quasi aridi sunt rami. Intus est medulla quae viget: intus sunt folia arborum, intus fructus, sed aestatem expectant. Ergo nos scimus, &c.*

c *This we know that we are translated from death to life, because we loue the brethren.* Hereupon saith he, d *What doe we know? that we are translated from death to life. Whereby doe we know it? Because we loue the brethren. Let no man aske of another man; let him returne to his owne heart: if he finde there loue to the brethren, let him be without doubt that he is passed from death to life. He is now on the right hand. Let him not regard that his glory is now hid; when the Lord shall come, then his glory shall appeare. For he is aliue, but yet as in the winter; the root is aliue, but the branches are in a manner dry. Within is the pith that liueth, within are the leaues, within are the fruits, but they looke for a summer. Therefore we know, that we are translated from death to life, because we loue the brethren.* Where we see both by the

text

text it ſelfe, and by the expoſition of this auncient Father, that by loue towards them that are our brethrē in the faith of Ieſus Chriſt we are to take knowledge and aſſurance of our being tranſlated from death to life, that is, of our own ſaluation, & that ſo as to be *without doubt* thereof, & yet this wrangler doubteth not to ſay, *This place hath not ſo much as any ſhew of words for him.* The point in queſtion is affirmed, not in ambiguous and doubtfull words, but euidently and apparantly, and yet hee goeth away with, *This place hath not ſo much as any ſhew of words for him*, nay, *this text maketh flat againſt him.* But why ſo, I pray you? *What need was there*, ſaith he, *to ſeeke charity in his heart for ſecuritie of his Saluation, if his faith aſſured him thereof?* But why doth he not anſwer to the point? Doth not S. *Auſtin* teach the faithfull an aſſurance of Saluation, be it by faith, be it by charity, let not that here be the queſtion? Is there to the faithfull by S. *Auſtines* iudgement, any aſſurance of ſaluation? He could not tell how directly to deny it, & yet with a Romiſh and impudent face paſſeth it ouer, as if there were no ſuch thing. The onely ſhift that he inſinuateth, is this, that this aſſurāce ſpoken of by S. *Auſtine*, is by charity, and not by faith. But what then, is there aſſurance by charity? No ſuch matter; for hee hath told vs before, that charity is ſeated in the [e] *darke corners of the wil*, and we cannot tell whether we haue it or not: And ſo whereas the Apoſtle, and by him S. *Auſtine* ſay, that *we know that we are tranſlated from death to life, becauſe we loue the brethren*, hee contrariwiſe ſaith: We cannot know that we are tranſlated from death to life, becauſe we cannot know that we loue the brethren, in both points abſolutely contradicting both the one and the other. But to his fooliſh queſtion I anſwere him, that the affirming of the aſſurance of faith, is no deniall of the means & helps from which it gathereth and increaſeth this aſſurance. Faith giueth aſſurance of Saluation by the word of God, not onely by apprehending the promiſes of life & Saluation, but alſo by obſeruing ſuch marks & tokens as the word of God ſetteth down, to deſcribe thē to whom this ſaluation doth appertain, which whē a man findeth in himſelf, his faith therby giueth him the cōfort of ſaluation, becauſe it beleeueth that which the word of God hath deliuered, concerning them in whō thoſe ſigns & marks are found. Therfore it doth not onely look to that which Chriſt ſaith, that *whoſoeuer beleeueth ſhall haue euerlaſting life*, [f] Ioh. 3. 16.

[e] Sect. 6.

g Iohn 8.47. *life*, but because Christ also saith, g *He that is of God, heareth Gods word*, therfore the faithful man delighting in the word of God, beleeueth concerning himself, that he is of God. Because the Apostle b Rom. 10.13. saith, h *Euery one that calleth vpon the name of the Lord shall be saued*, therfore the faithful man vnfainedly calling vpon the name of the Lord, beleeueth of himself that he shalbe saued. And so whereas S. *Iohn* saith, that *we know that we are translated frō death to life, because we loue the brethren*, it is our faith wherby we take this knowledge, that we are translated from death to life, because we loue the brethren; for how should we know it, but that our faith, beleeueth that which the word of God hath taught vs in that behalfe? How idly then doth he argue, that we need not seeke for charity for assurance of Saluation, if we be assured thereof by faith, when charity it selfe is appointed for a helpe of that assurance which wee haue by faith; whē from charity it is in some part that faith by the word of God, conceiueth a reason of that assurance? But by his answere to these places, the Reader may esteeme of his wilfulnesse in al the rest. How miserable is the case of those men, who being so fast bound with the bonds of truth, as that they know not which way to stirre, yet haue no heart, nor conscience, to giue assent to that which they are no way able to resist?

## 15. W. Bishop.

Sup. 3. cap. Mat. *The next Author he citeth is* S. Hylarie, *in these words*: The Kingdom of heauen which our Lord professed to be in himself, his wil is that it be hoped for, without any doubtfulnes of vncertain will (at all, *is an addition*) otherwise there is no iustification by faith, if faith it selfe be made doubtfull. *First, he saith, but as wee say, that the Kingdome of heauen is to be hoped for, without any doubtfulnesse; for we professe Certainety of hope, and deny onely Certainety of faith, as* M. Perkins *confesseth before. And as for faith, we say with him also, it is not doubtfull but very certain. What maketh this to the purpose, that a man must beleeue his own Saluation, when* S. Hilary *speaketh there of faith of the resurrection of the dead. His last Author is* S. Bernard: Epist. 107. Who is the iust man, but he that being loued of God, loues him againe? which comes not to passe but by the spirit, reuealing by faith the eternall promise of God, of his Saluation to come, which reue-

reuelation is nothing else, but the infusion of spirirituall grace, by which the deeds of the flesh are mortified, the man is prepared to the kingdome of heauen, together receiuing in one spirit, that whereby he may presume, that he is loued and loues againe. *Note that he saith the reuelation of the spirit, to be nothing else but the infusion of spirituall graces, and comfort, whereby a man hath some feeling of Gods goodnesse towards him, by which (he saith) he may presume, but not beleeue certainely, that he is loued of God. But let* S. Bernard *in the same place interpret him self, there he speaketh thus, as I cited once before:* It is giuen to men to tast before hand, somewhat of the blisse to come, &c. Of the which knowledge of our selues now in part perceiued, a man doth in the meane season glory in hope, but not yet in security. *His opinion then is expresly, that for all the reuelations of the spirit made by faith vnto vs, we are not assured for Certainty of our Saluation, but feele great ioy, through the hope wee haue heereafter to receiue it.*

## R. Abbot.

The words of *Hilarie* are very plaine, that [a] *without doubting we are to hope for the kingdome of heauen*, and that it is *the will of Christ* that we do so. Whereof he addeth a reason, *Otherwise there is no iustification by faith, if faith it selfe become doubtfull*, which if we will accommodate to that that goeth before, it must import thus much, that we cannot by our faith be iustified, to the obtaining of the kingdome of heauen, if we do not vndoubtedly beleeue to obtaine the same. *M. Bishop* answereth first, that *Hilarie saith but as they say.* No doth? Why, do they say that *without doubting we must hope for the kingdome of heauen?* He saith yea, but forgetting the prouerb, that *a liar must beare a braine.* For in the leafe before he hath set it [b] downe for a principle, confirmed as he saith, by aboue an hundred texts of holy writ, that *the faithfull must stand in feare of their owne Saluation.* There cannot bee certaine and vndoubted hope, where there is a necessity of feare. If a man must stand in feare; then can he not hope without doubt. Thus he knoweth not what he saith, nor what to say; We must feare, and we must not feare; we must doubt, and we must not doubt: there is Certainetie, and there is no Certainety. Whereas he saith that *M. Perkins* confesseth, that they

[a] *Hilar. in Mat. cap. 5. Regnum cœlorum vult Dominus sine aliqua incerta voluntatis ambiguitate sperari: alioquin iustificatio ex fide nulla est si fides ipsa sit ambigua.*

[b] Sect. 10.

profesſe

profeſſe *certaintie of hope*, he ſpeaketh to that purpoſe ſomewhat, but ſo as that he confeſſeth that certaintie to be as they affirme it, onely probable and coniecturall, and not that which is here ſpoken of, which is *without doubting*. Theſe words therefore are directly contrarie to that which they ſay, becauſe here it is ſayd that wee muſt *without doubt hope for the kingdome of heauen*, whereas they ſay, we muſt neuer ſo hope for it but that we muſt feare and ſtand in doubt. Whereas he maketh a difference betwixt *certaintie of hope*, and *certaintie of faith*, it is nothing to this place. For when *Hilarie* for reaſon of that he ſaith, that *we muſt hope without doubting*, bringeth in, that *faith if it be doubtfull doth not iuſtifie*, he plainely ſheweth that he confoundeth *faith* and *hope*, and taketh them here both for theſame, and importeth that we are to beleeue to be made partakers of the kingdome of heauen, which is the ſame as to beleeue our owne Saluation. But ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *Hilarie there ſpeaketh of the faith of the reſurrection of the dead.* Verie lewdly and vnhoneſtly: for there is not a word there ſpoken of the reſurrection of the dead, but onely to ſhew how Chriſt confirmeth his to the vndoubted [c] *confidence and hope of thoſe good things which are to come, and ſhall continue for euer.* And that he may yet further vnderſtand that *Hilarie* by hope meaneth otherwiſe then they doe, he ſaith in another place; [d] *that the accompliſhing of our bliſſe requireth a hope that is without feare of doubt. We haue thereto neede of the confidence of a firme and conſtant opinion, and an vnchangeable minde, becauſe to be confident is more then to hope. We are therefore to be confident therein, leaſt the wrath of God waxing hot, do ſuddenly deſtroy vs from the right way. For he is faithfull who ſaith, He that beleeueth in me, ſhall not be iudged, but ſhall paſſe from death to life.* By which words it appeareth manifeſtly, that the true *hope* is not, as *M. Biſhop* taketh it, a probable and likely conceit ioyned with vncertaintie and feare, but a confident hope, a ſetled and conſtant hope, beleeuing ſtedfaſtly without feare or doubt to receiue that life and bliſſe that Chriſt hath promiſed. At the next place of *Bernard* hee againe very wilfully ſhutteth his eies, and refuſeth to ſee that which hee cannot chuſe but ſee. What can be more directly ſpoken to the matter in hand, then [e] *that the ſpirit by faith reueleth to a man the eternal purpoſe of God concerning his owne ſaluation to come?* Why doth he deny to a man

[c] *Confirmare nos in ſpem bonorum æternorum (fiduciam futurorum) laborat.*

[d] *In Pſal. 2. in fine. Non trepidâ ſpem neque ambiguam perfectio beatitudinis exigit. Confidentia ad id opus firmæ opinionis ſcilicet & indemutabilis voluntatis; quia plus ſit confidere quam ſperare. Confidendum ergo eſt ne nos à via iuſtâ exardeſcens breui ira Dei deperdat. Fidelis enim eſt qui ait, Qui credit in me, &c.*

[e] *Bern. ſrd. epiſt. 107. Reuelante ſpiritu per fidem homini æternum Dei propoſitum ſuper ſalute ſua futura.*

a man to beleeue his owne Saluation, when the ſpirit by *faith* reuealeth to him the purpoſe of God, that he ſhall be ſaued? Here is no ambiguitie of words, here is an expreſſe affirming of the point in queſtion, that *the ſpirit by faith reuealeth to a man the euerlaſting purpoſe of God concerning his owne Saluation.* What haue we now for anſwer hereof? *Note*, ſaith he: *that he ſaith the reuelation of the ſpirit, to be nothing elſe but the infuſion of ſpirituall grace.* But what is that to the purpoſe what this *reuelation* is? Why doth he not anſwer to the point, that *the ſpirit of God by faith reuealeth vnto a man the purpoſe of God concerning his own Saluation?* Lee that *reuelation* be howſoeuer, it is ſufficient for vs that God by his ſpirit reuealeth to a man that, whence he hath to beleeue his owne Saluation. Now *Bernard* indeed declareth this [f] *reuelation to bee nothing elſe but the infuſion of ſpirituall grace, by which whileſt the deeds of the fleſh are mortified, a man is prepared to the kingdome which fleſh and bloud inherite not, receiuing together in one ſpirit, both whereby hee may preſume that he is loued, and doth alſo loue againe.* But this impeacheth nothing that we ſay, nay it ſerueth wholy to ſtrenghen our aſſertion. For how doth *faith* by the *infuſion of ſpirituall grace*, apprehend the purpoſe of God concerning our Saluation, but in that it beleeueth by the word of God, that they to whom ſuch and ſuch graces are giuen, are the children of God, and ſhall be ſaued; that they who are called and iuſtified, ſhall alſo bee glorified? And thus *S. Bernard* at large declareth in that Epiſtle, that [g] *at the riſing of the ſunne of righteouſneſſe (in our iuſtification) the ſecret that was hidden from the beginning, concerning them that are predeſtinate and ſhall bee bleſſed, beginneth to appeare out of the depth of eternity, whileſt a man called by the feare of God, and made iuſt by loue, preſumeth that he is one of the number of the bleſſed, knowing that whom hee hath iuſtified them hee hath alſo glorified*: that [h] *a man is to take for the declarer of that ſecret the ſpirit iuſtifying him, and thereby teſtifying to his ſpirit that he is the child of God*; that [i] *in his iuſtification he is to take knowledge of the counſell of God, and* that *therein he beginneth to know euen as hee is knowne, there being giuen to him to perceiue ſomewhat before hand of his future bliſſe, accordingly as hee hath lien hid frō euerlaſting*

f *Quæ ſanè reuelatio non eſt aliud quam infuſio gratiæ ſpiritualis, nec quam dum facta carnis mortificatur, homo ad regnum præparatur quod caro & ſanguis non poſſident, ſimul accipiens in vno ſpiritu & vnde ſe præſumat amatum, & vnde redamet ne gratis amatus ſit.*

g *Sic ad ortum ſolis iuſticiæ ſacramentum abſconditum a ſeculis de prædeſtinatis & beatificandis emergere quodammodo incipit ex abyſſo æternitatis, dum quiſq; vocatus per timorē, iuſtificatus per amorem, præſumit ſe quoque eſſe de numero beatorū, ſciens nimirum quia quos iuſtificauit illos & magnificauit.*

h *Habet homo huius rei indicem ſpiritum iuſtificantem eum, ipſo teſtificantem ſpiritui ſuo quod*

*filius Dei & ipſe ſis. Agnoſce conſilium Dei in iuſtificatione tua.* i. *Id quiſq; accipit in iuſtificatione ſua vt incipiat & ipſe cognoſcere ſicut & cognitus eſt, cùm videlicet datur & ipſi præſentiæ aliquid de ſua ipſius futura beatitudine, quemadmodum ab æterno latuit in prædeſtinante, plenius apparituram in beatificante.*

*in God by whom he was predeſtinate, and ſhall more fully appeare in the ſame God, when he ſhall make him bleſſed.* This is the *reuealing* that Saint *Bernard* ſpeaketh of *by infuſion of ſpirituall grace:* this we approue and confirme, and hereof before I noted, that faith to ſtrengthen it ſelfe in the aſſurance of Saluation, looketh to thoſe fruits and effects of faith and of the grace of God, which are ſet downe as ſignes and markes of them to whom the promiſes of Saluation do belong. But now *M. Biſhop* ouerturneth all that *Bernard* ſpeaketh in this behalfe; for whereas he ſetteth downe *the feare of God, repentance, charitie, praier, purpoſe of new life,* as the things whereby that *reuelation* is performed vnto vs, he denieth that there can be any ſuch *reuelation,* becauſe repentance, the feare of God, charitie and ſuch like are *ſeated in the darke corners of the will,* and a man knoweth not whether he haue the ſame or not. A man, he ſaith, may hope that he is in the ſtate of grace, and muſt thinke that if he be not ſo, it is long of himſelfe, but he cannot know that he is ſo. Thus *S. Bernard* teacheth, that *God of his great goodneſſe bringeth the heart of man into his wonderfull light*; but *M. Biſhop* keepeth him in horrible darkneſſe, where a man awake and in his right wits, can conceiue nothing but dread and feare. Therefore it is but for a ſhift that here he maketh *Bernard* to ſay, that *by infuſion of grace a man hath ſome feeling of Gods goodneſſe towards him*; for how can he haue any feeling of Gods goodneſſe towards him by *infuſion of grace,* when he cannot know that he hath any infuſed grace? Albeit *Bernard* doth not ſay only, that a man hath *ſome feeling of Gods goodneſſe towards him,* but that to the iuſtified man, *it is giuen to haue a fore-feeling of his owne bliſſe.* Therefore he ſo *preſumeth* that *he is beloued of God,* as that he *certainly beleeueth it.* For a man is certainlie to beleeue what the ſpirit of God reuealeth. But *the ſpirit reuealeth to the iuſtified man the purpoſe of God concerning his owne Saluation.* He is therefore certainly to beleeue, that he is beloued of God and ſhall be ſaued. And ſo *S Bernard* ſaith that [k] *he acknowledgeth himſelfe to be the child of grace, that he hath the triall and proofe of the fatherly affection of Gods goodneſſe towards him*; that *he perceiueth, & cõfidently reſolueth that he is beloued of God* that *he preſumeth himſelf to be of the number of the bleſſed* And what is it to *preſume* but to take for certaine, and certainly to beleeue that that is true whereof we doe preſume? But ſaith *M. Biſhop*: *Let S Bernard interpret*

[k] *Agnoſcit ſe meritò quidem nunc iam in re ſed gratiæ filium, quippe qui paternum erga ſe diuinæ bonitatis experitur affectum, &c. ſe confidit amari, præſentit amari, &c. preſumit ſe eſſe de numero beatorum.*

*interpret himſelfe in the ſame place.* Be it ſo; but I will tranſlate for him, vnleſſe he could tranſlate more faithfully then he doth. [l] *It is giuen to the iuſtified man,* ſaith *Bernard, to haue ſom fore-feeling of his own bliſſe to come.* And what? wil M. *Biſhop* deny him to belieue that which S. *Bernard* ſaith he doth in part already feele? Yea, but it followeth: [m] *Of which knowledge of himſelfe now already perceiued in part, he for the time reioyceth in hope, but not yet in ſecurity.* And what of this? Marry, ſaith he, *his opinion then is, that for all the reuelations of the ſpirit made by faith vnto vs, we are not aſſured for Certainetie of our Saluation, but feele great ioy through the hope we haue hereafter to receiue it.* But he hath a very wrong opinion of *Bernards* opinion. What? becauſe a man reioiceth not in *ſecurity* for the preſent, doth it follow that he hath no aſſured Certainty of Saluation to come? And what? is there not aſſured Certainety to be conceiued of that that is reuealed by the ſpirit of God? Surely [n] *the ſpirit is truth,* & we are fully to aſſure our ſelues of that that is reuealed thereby, as before was ſaid: And if there be no aſſurance, what *glorying or reioycing* can there be? He ſaith, that *we feele great ioy through the hope we haue hereafter to receiue it.* But what ioy can there be of that, of which as he ſaith we muſt continually ſtand in feare? If there be no aſſurance, there can be no ioying or glorying; if there be ioying & glorying, it muſt ariſe from Certainty and aſſurance. S. *Bernard* in ỳ phraſe of *reioycing*, or *glorying* in *hope*, alludeth to the words of the Apoſtle, [o] *We reioyce or glory vnder the hope of the glory of God.* Vpon which words *Chryſoſtome* obſerueth, that by the word of [p] *glorying*, the Apoſtle *declareth what mind he is to beare that hath tied his faith to God. For he muſt haue a full perſwaſion,* ſaith he, *not only of the things that are already giuen, but alſo of the things to come, as if they were already giuẽ. For a man glorieth or reioiceth of theſe things which he hath in hand. Becauſe therfore the hope of the things to come, is as ſure and certaine as the things already giuen, the Apoſtle ſaith, wee alike reioyce thereof.* So then Saint *Bernard* by the ſame phraſe teacheth the iuſtified man as touching Certainety of expectation to glorie in hope of the bliſſe to come, as if the ſame were already giuen vnto him. Therfore he ſaith of him in the ſame epiſtle: [q] *Hee glorieth in the hope of the glory of the ſonnes of God, which now euen neere at hand with open face he beholdeth, leaping for ioy at this new light and ſaying,*

l *Datur ipſi præſentire aliquid de ſua ipſius futura beatitudine.*

m *De qua tamen iam percepta ſuimet ex parte notitia, interim quidem gloriatur in ſpe, nondum tamen in ſecuritate.*

n 1. Iohn 5. 6.

o Rom. 5. 2.

p *Chryſoſt. in Rom. hom. 9. Gloriamur ait, vt intelligas quali animo præditum eum eſſe oportet, qui fidem ſuam Deo obſtrinxit. Neq; enim illi ſolum plenam perſuaſionem facta eſſe oportet de ijs quæ data ſunt, ſed de futuris tanquam iam datis. Gloriatur enim quiſquis per ijs quæ iam in manu habet. Quoniam igitur rerũ futurarũ ſpes ſic firma eſt atque euidens vt & iam data ſit, aquè inquit & ſuper illis gloriamur.*

q Epiſt. 107. 2. ad med. *Gloriaris inquit præter ſpem in ſpe gloriæ filiorum Dei quam iam nimirum è vicino reuelata facie exultans nouo in lumine ſpeculatur, & dicit ſignatum eſt, &c.*

*The light of thy countenance is sealed vpon vs, O Lord, thou hast put gladnesse in my heart.* Now therefore whereas he saith *he glorieth in hope, but not yet in security*, wee must not thinke that by denying *securitie* he ouerthroweth *reioycing in hope*, but signifieth that much conflict remaineth for the attainment of that, which notwithstanding certainly & vndoubtedly he hopeth for. He denieth him so to reioyce, as if there were no further dangers to be feared, no further opposition to be expected, no further temptations to bee endured, no further enemies to be resisted, and importeth that there is much fighting and wrastling, much care and sorrow, many perplexities and troubles yet to be forecast and looked for. We may not then be *secure*, as if there were nothing any more to trouble vs, but we may be *secure*, and without doubt of an happy issue & deliuerance from all troubles, and this is the hope that wee reioyce in. Therefore *S. Austin* saith, as before was cited: [r] *Ioy that thou art redeemed, but yet not in reall effect: as touching hope be secure (be without feare.)* So againe: [f] *If a man haue in his heart loue towards the brethren, let him be secure (let him be without doubt) that hee is passed from death to life.* And thus doth *Cyprian* describe the condition of faithfull Christians, [t] *There is with vs strength of hope and stedfastnesse of faith, and amidst the ruines of the decaying world a courragious mind, and constant vertue, and patience, alwaies ioyfull, and a soule alwaies secure (or without doubt) of God to be our God.* To be short, how farre Saint *Bernard* was from denying the *securitie* of particular faith and hope, appeareth by that that before hath beene said in the twelfth section, whereby it is plaine that it was not his purpose here to require that necessity that *M. Bishop* doth, of doubt & feare.

r *August. in Psal. 37. Spe securus esto.*
f *Idem. in epist. Ioan. tract. 3. supra Sect. 14.*
t *Cyprian. cont. Demetr. Viget apud nos spei robur & firmitas fidei & inter ipsas seculi habentis ruinas erecta mens, & immobilis virtus & nunquam nisi lata patientia & de Deo suo semper anima secura.*

## 16. W. Bishop.

*This passage of testimonies being dispatched, let vs now come vnto the fiue other reasons, which* M. Perkins *produceth in defence of their opinion.*

*The first reason is,* That in faith there are two things, the one is an infallible assurance of those things which we beleeue: *This we grant and therehence proue (as you heard before) that there can bee no faith of our particular Salvation, because we bee not so fully assured of that, but that we must stand in feare of losing it, according to that,* Hold that which thou hast, lest perhaps another receiue thy crown. *But the*

Apoc. 3.

second

*ſecond point of faith, puts all out of queſtion.* For *(ſaith M. Perkins)* it doth aſſure vs of remiſſion of our ſinnes, and of life euerlaſting in particular. *Proue that Sir, and we need no more.* It is proued out of *S. Iohn:* As many as receiued him, he gaue them power to be made the ſonnes of God, namely, to them that beleeue in his name. *This text commeth much too ſhort: he gaue them power to be the ſonnes, that is, gaue them ſuch grace, that they were able, and might if they would, be ſons of God, but did not aſſure them of that neither: much leſſe that they ſhould ſo continue vnto their liues end. I omit his vnſauory diſcourſe of* eating, *and* beleeuing Chriſt, *and applying vnto vs his benefits, (which he might be aſhamed to make vnto vs, that admit no part of it to be true) I confeſſe that therein faith hath his part, if it be ſoyned with charity, and frequentation of the Sacraments. This is it which S. Paul teacheth,* That not by the works of *Moſes law*, but by faith in Chriſt Ieſus we receiue the promiſes of the ſpirit, & ſhall haue hereafter the performance, if we obſerue thoſe things which Chriſt hath commanded vs. *But what is this to Certainty of Saluation?* But *(ſaith he)* it is the property of faith, to apply Chriſt vnto vs, & proues it out of *S. Auguſtine*, Beleeue, and thou haſt eaten: *Againe*, Send vp thy faith, and thou maieſt hold Chriſt in heauen: &c. *To which, and ſuch like authorities, I anſwere, that we finde Chriſt, we hold Chriſt, we ſee Chriſt, by faith, beleeuing him to be the ſonne of God, and redeemer of the world, and Iudge of the quicke and the dead: and we vnderſtand, and digeſt all the myſteries of this holy word. But where is it once ſaid, in any of theſe ſentences, that we are aſſured of our Saluation? we beleeue all theſe points and many more: but we ſhall be neuer the neerer our Saluation, vnleſſe we obſerue Gods cõmandements:* The ſeruant which knowes his Maſters will, and doth it not, ſhall be beaten with many ſtripes. Then you are my friends *(ſaith our Sauiour)* when you ſhall do the things which I command you: *which we being vncertaine to performe, aſſure not our ſelues of his friendſhip, but when to our knowledge we go as neere it as we can, and demand pardon of our wants, we liue in good hope of it.*

Iohn 1.

Gal. 3.

Tract. 15. in Iohn.

Luk. 12. Iohn. 15.

## R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins* affirmeth, that the nature of true faith ſtandeth not only in an *vnfallible*, but alſo in a *particular aſſurance* of remiſſion of ſins & life euerlaſting. *Vnfallible aſſurãce M. Biſhop* acknowledgeth,

but thence will conclude against *particular assurance of our own Saluation, because*, saith he, *we be not so fully assured of that, but that we must stand in feare of losing it.* This he saith he hath proued before, but his proofe thereof is already disproued: onely heere for supply hee bringeth the words of Christ to the Church of *Philadelphia*;

a Reuel. 3.11. a *Hold that which thou hast, lest another receiue thy crowne.* Which supply of his, is euen according to the maner of his former proofe; he nameth a place, and so leaueth it; be it right or wrong, what is that to him? If yee aske him how he inferreth that that he would proue thereby, you must pardon him, he cannot tel. It is very doubtfull what may here be imported by *the crowne*: whether the Angel, that is, the Bishop of the Church of *Philadelphia* bee particularly warned to take heed of forgoing or losing any of them whom he

b Phil. 4.1. 1. Thess. 2.19. should account, as *S. Paul* speaketh, b *his ioy and crowne of reioycing at the comming of Iesus Christ*: or whether the same Church be generally admonished to take heed of loosing *the crowne* of the publike calling and grace of God. For so God to signifie the establishing of his kingdome of grace amongst the Iewes, amongst

c Ezech. 16.12. other words saith: c *I set a beautifull crowne vpon thy head.* To which honour done vnto them, when they yeelded not correspondence of dutifull obedience and thankfulnesse to God, our Sauiour Christ foretold them, that d *the kingdome of God* (which was their *crowne*)

d Matth. 21.43. *should be taken from them, and giuen to a nation that should bring forth the fruit thereof.* The like we take to bee the importment of *the crowne* in this place; and that the Church of *Philadelphia* is admonished to take heed, lest by relapsing from her goodnesse and vertue, she should lose the honour of the condition, and state of a Church which God had called her vnto: euen as the Church of

e Reuel. 2.5. *Ephesus* is before threatned; e *I will come against thee shortly, and will remoue thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent*: the *candlestick* in the one place being meant of the same, which by *the crowne* is intended in the other. But if Master *Bishop* will needs vnderstand *the crowne* to be meant of Saluation and life eternall, we answere him, that this *crowne* being proper to Gods elect, cannot be lost by them to whom it is assigned; yet so as that withall we say, that God in his wisdome hath appointed a meanes, whereby hee will preserue them that they may not lose *the crowne*. To this end he vseth many exhortations and admonitions, many terrours

rours and feares, many corrections and chaſtiſements, whereby hee hedgeth and compaſſeth them in, that whereas by relinquiſhing their faith and obedience, they ſhould indeede runne into hauock and ruine of themſelues, they may hereby be wrought to perſeuere and continue therein, to the obtaining of *the crowne*. Thus his Maſter [f] *Bellarmine* confeſſeth, that this place hath his vſe in reſpect of them who notwithſtanding by Gods predeſtination are holden that they cannot loſe the *crowne*. If then wee doe ſo vnderſtand *the crowne*, yet the place auaileth *M Biſhop* no thing: but being ſo taken, how one man ſhould haue the *crowne*, and by his loſing it, another ſhould receiue it in place of him, all his wit and learning is not able to reſolue vs. This place therefore maketh nothing againſt the *particular aſſurance* of faith, but for proofe therof *M Perkins* hath brought that that is very pregnant and cleare. Firſt, hee allegeth the words of Saint *Iohn*, [g] *As many as receiued him, to them he gaue power to be the ſonnes of God, euen to them that beleeue in his name*. Where he argueth, that *to receiue Chriſt*, and *to beleeue in Chriſt*, doe both import the ſame thing, becauſe the one of them is put for the expoſition of the other. Now to *receiue*, is to take in particular to a mans ſelfe, to applie to himſelfe, to apprehend or lay hold of, for conueying a thing to himſelfe. Becauſe therefore to *beleeue in Chriſt* is *to receiue Chriſt*, it followeth, that *to beleeue in Chriſt* is to take Chriſt, to apprehend him, and lay hold of him with all his benefits, for conueying & applying of him particularly to a mans ſelfe; to beleeue particularly for himſelf, to make vſe of Chriſt, according to that the Scripture deſcribeth him, to himſelf. True faith therfore according to the meaſure of it, aſſureth infallibly, not in the general only by principle, but in particular alſo by concluſion & application to it ſelfe. This being the collection that we make from this place, and plainely noted by *M. Perkins*, *M. Biſhop* to it anſwereth nothing, either his eies dazeling that he could not ſee, or his wits failing that he knew not what to ſay. But to delude the Reader, he will ſay ſomewhat to the place, though he ſay nothing to the purpoſe; yet that which he doth ſay, he ſaith out of the ſchoole of *Pelagius* the heretike, and not out of the doctrine of Ieſus Chriſt. *He gaue them power; that is*, ſaith he, *he gaue them ſuch grace, that they were able, and might if they would be the ſons of God.*

[f] *Bellarm. de grat. & libero arbitr. lib 2. cap. 13. Renuntiat ſi non perſeueraret &c. Amittere coronam ſuam, ſed hac admonitione perterritus &c. ſine dubio fortiſſimè tenebit quod habet, & conſolatur ſe perfuturum ad coronam quã non habet.*

[g] Iohn 1. 12.

But what? Did he giue them to be able onely, and did he not giue them to will also to be the sonnes of God? Did hee leaue them to their own will, either to be or not to be the sons of God? Of them to whom he gaue this *power*, he saith, that [h] *they are borne, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God*, who not of our will, but [i] *of his owne will begat vs by the word of truth, that wee should be as the first fruits of his creatures*; and will *M. Bishop* goe about to perswade vs, that it is at our own will that we are begotten and borne againe? The *power* here spoken of, should rather be translated a *prerogatiue* then a *power*, and therefore *Cyril* expresseth it by the terme of [k] *a supernaturall dignitie*, and affirmeth, that therby is meant [l] *the adoption and grace of God*, which is not such as Master *Bishop* speaketh of, whereby it is onely giuen vnto vs [m] *to be able if we wil, but also to wil*, not only wherby we may be, but wherby we are the sonnes of God, as before hath been declared in the question of *Free will*. And whereas he addeth: *He did not assure them of that neither, much lesse that they should so continue vnto their liues end*; he should vnderstand, that by [n] *the true grace of God* that comfort is ministred vnto the faithfull, to say as Saint *Iohn* directeth them; [o] *Behold what loue the Father hath giuen vnto vs*, [*] *that wee are called, and are the sonnes of God: Euen now are we the sonnes of God, and we know that when he shall appeare, we shall be like vnto him*; thereby teaching the effect of faith, both to giue assurance of present state, and of perseuerance also to future glorie. But all this Master *Bishop* hangeth vpon the will of man, hauing learned of his father *Pelagius*, to ascribe to God [p] *the power whereby wee are able to be or may be*, but to our selues *the willing and acting* of our adoption, whereby we are indeed the *sonnes of God*. But of this thus briefly, as being beside the matter here in hand, and the question of *Free will* being debated at large before. To shew somewhat further that point of *particular assurance*, Master *Perkins* addeth, that Christ setteth forth himselfe, *as the bread of life and water of life*, and commendeth vnto vs *the eating of his bodie, and the drinking of his blood*, and maketh this *eating and drinking* the same as *to beleeue in him*. Hence he inferreth a proportion betwixt *eating and beleeuing*, that as he that eateth receiueth and taketh to himselfe the meat that he eateth, & digesteth the same to the nourishment of euery part, euen so he that beleeueth doth by his faith

[h] Ioh. 1.13.

[i] Iam.1.18.

[k] *Cyril. in Ioan. lib.1.cap.13. Ascendamus ad supernaturalem dignitatem per Christum.*

[l] *Cap.14.*

[m] *Aug ust. de corrept. & grat. cap.11. Est in nobis per hanc gratiam non solum posse quod volumus, verumetiam velle quod possumus.*

[n] 1.Pet.5.12.

[o] 1.Ioh.3.1.

[*] *Vt filij Dei nominemur & simus. Vulgat.*

[p] *August.cont. Pelag.& Celest. lib. 1. ca 3. Possibilitatem (qua potest homo esse iustus) datam confitetur à creatore naturæ: voluntatem & actionem nostræ esse asserit.*

all

as the hand, and mouth, and ſtomach of the ſoule, receiue & take vnto him Ieſus Chriſt with all his benefits, to become particularlie his ſtrength, and comfort, and nouriſhment vnto euerlaſting life. Now all this ſpeech of *eating, and beleeuing, and applying vntovs the benefits of Christ*, *M. Biſhop* ſaith *hee omitteth as an vnſauourie diſcourſe*; but the reaſon is becauſe pearles are vnſauorie to ſwine, and groſſe Capernaites know no eating of Chriſt but by the mouth, nor receiuing of him but into the bellie. But moſt ridiculous is that which hee addeth, *Hee might be aſhamed to make (this diſcourſe) vnto vs that admit no part of it to bee true.* For ſo might I briefly reiect his whole booke with the ſame words, that *he might be aſhamed to write the ſame to vs that admit no part of it to be true.* Hee ſhould vnderſtand, that *M. Perkins* had in hand to write that that is the truth, and not that that they would admit to bee true, who are ſworne to Antichriſt to maintaine his vntruthes. And ſeeing hee hath ſo pregnantly ſhewed thereby the nature of true and liuely faith, not by any inuention of his owne, but out of the very words of Chriſt, *M. Biſhop* might himſelfe bee iuſtly aſhamed to anſwer it ſo childiſhly and ſimply as he hath done. *I confeſſe*, ſaith he, *that faith hath his part therein.* But Saint *Auſtine* attributeth to faith not onely *a part therein*, but to bee the thing it ſelfe, euen the eating and drinking of the bodie and bloud of Chriſt. [q] *To beleeue in Chriſt*, ſaith hee, *is to eate the bread of life: he that beleeueth, eateth.* Why doth hee refuſe to ſpeake as Saint *Auſtine* ſpeaketh, but that like a carnall *Anthropophagus* hee referreth it to the mouth and to the bellie to *eate the fleſh of Chriſt, and to drinke his bloud*, not liſtening to that that *M. Perkins* had alledged vnto him out of the ſame *Auſtine*, [r] *Why preparеſt thou thy teeth and thy bellie? beleeue and thou haſt eaten.* But faith, he ſaith, hath his part therein, *if it be ioined with charitie and frequentation of the Sacraments.* Which if of his is very idle to vs, who hold no true faith but that [ſ] *which worketh by charitie*, and ſeeketh after the Sacraments, as being [t] *the ſeales of the righteouſneſſe of faith*, the very proper vſe whereof is to giue particular aſſurance to the faithfull of the mercy God towards them in Ieſus Chriſt. For as in humane contracts and gifts ſomewhat commonly is deliuered by earneſt or ſeale for confir-

q *Aug. in Ioan. tract. 26. Credere in Chriſtū hoc eſt manducare panem viuum.*

r *Ibid. tract. 25.*

ſ Gal. 5. 6.

t Rom. 4. 11.

confirming and ſure-making of the maine, ſo hath God thought good in his couenants & promiſes of grace, to appoint his Sacraments particularly to be vſed and applied to euery man, that euerie beleeuer knowing Chriſt by the ſame Sacraments to bee figured and offered vnto vs, may take knowledge by the deliuerie thereof, that Chriſt is his to eternal life by faith in his name; it being in effect laid vnto him thereby; Thou beleeueſt the promiſes of God in Chriſt concerning grace and forgiueneſſe of ſins vnto euerlaſting life: take this for ſeale and aſſurance, that by thy faith in Chriſt the whole benefit therof appertaineth vnto thee. Therfore Chriſt ſaith very effectually, *Take, eat, this is my body: Drinke ye, this is my blood*, as by the Sacrament deliuering himſelfe vnto vs, and in himſelfe the whole fruit and benefit of that that he hath done for vs. Why doth he deliuer theſe *ſeales of the righteouſnes of faith* particularly vnto me, but that he would haue me know, that the promiſes of righteouſnes are therby through my faith ſealed particularly vnto me? Thus therefore faith ioined with *frequentation of the Sacraments*, doth ſo much the more effectually miniſter vnto vs this comfort of particular aſſurance towards God. All this is vnſauoury to *M. Biſhop*; but let vs leaue him to his acornes and draffe, and let him leaue this feeding to them who therein haue learned to [u] *taſte how gracious the Lord is*. Now to ſhew that the vſe of faith is *to receiue*, *M. Perkins* allegeth the word of Saint *Paul*, that [x] *through faith we receiue the promiſe of the ſpirit*, importing thereby that faith is as it were *the hand*, into which, being holden forth vnto God, he giueth the ſpirit which he hath promiſed: that faith apprehendeth and embraceth the promiſe of God concerning this gift of his ſpirit, and that thereby we become partakers thereof. To this alſo *M. Biſhop* anſwereth nothing, onely he will ſeeme to allege the words, and wholly peruerteth them. For whereas the Apoſtle maketh *the ſpirit* the thing promiſed, hee citeth the place, as if the ſpirit were named as the promiſer. And whereas the Apoſtle ſpeaketh as of a thing [y] already performed to them to whom he wrote, hee citeth it as of a thing futurely to be performed, & that with a condition, *if we obſerue thoſe things which Chriſt hath commanded*, whereas the ſpirit is promiſed, not *if wee obſerue*, but [z] *to cauſe vs to keepe his ſtatutes and obſerue his iudgements and do them*. Yet hereupon he demandeth, *What is this to*

[u] 1 Pet. 2. 3.

[x] Gal. 3. 14.

[y] *Ibid. verſ.* 2.

[z] Ezech. 36. 27.

*the*

*the Certainty of Saluation?* I anſwere, that it is ſo ſtrong to proue the Certainty of Saluation, as that againſt it he could finde nothing more ſafe for himſelfe, then to ſay nothing to it. For if to beleeue in Chriſt, be to *receiue Chriſt*, and ſo to receiue him, as that thereby we eate the fleſh of Chriſt, and drinke his blood, the beleeuer hath this for a certainty deliuered vnto him by Chriſt himſelfe, that *he hath eternall life, and that Chriſt will raiſe him vp at the laſt day.* For [a] *whoſoeuer eateth my fleſh*, ſaith Chriſt, *and drinketh my bloud, hath eternall life, and I will raiſe him vp at the laſt day.* The beleeuer [a] Ioh. 6. 54. therefore by his faith conceiueth a particular certainty and aſſurance of his owne Saluation, and is thereby [b] *to know that hee hath eternall life.* Now to ſhew the effect of faith, *M. Perkins* bringeth [b] 1. Ioh. 5. 13. ſundry places of *Auſtin, Ambroſe, Chryſoſtome, Tertullian, Bernard*, that by faith *we touch Chriſt, we lay hold of him, we finde him, we ſee him, we eate him, we digeſt him.* Whereto *M. Biſhop* anſwereth full wiſely, *we finde Chriſt, we hold Chriſt, we ſee Chriſt by faith, beleeuing him to be the ſonne of God, and redeemer of the world, and Iudge of quicke and dead*, thereby making this *finding, and ſeeing, and holding, and digeſting* of Chriſt *by faith*, to bee no other thing but what is incident to the diuell, becauſe all theſe things the diuell beleeueth, and knoweth as well as he. But to ſee the giddineſſe of his head, reeling and ſtaggering he knoweth not whither, he ſaith, *we finde Chriſt, we hold him, and ſee him, we eate him, wee digeſt him by beleeuing* thus and thus, when hee hath plainly giuen vs before to vnderſtand, that for all his beleeuing, hee cannot tell whether he haue any thing to doe with Chriſt, whether hee haue receiued the grace of Chriſt, whether hee haue any true repentance, hope, charitie, and ſuch like, without which, Chriſt is neither holden, nor had at all. But ſuch darkneſſe is fit for them who leaue the waies of God, and make choice to tread the Labyrinthes and maze-rounds of their owne brain-ſicke imaginations. To his queſtion *where it is once ſaid in any of theſe ſentences, that we are aſſured of our Saluation:* I anſwere him, that it followeth of that for proofe whereof theſe ſentences were alleaged. For if the office of true faith be not onely generally to beleeue, but alſo particularly to apply that which it beleeueth, as hath been ſhewed, and all thoſe ſpeeches alledged doe import, then it followeth that according to the meaſure of it, it yeeldeth a particular aſſurance of Saluation

uation to euery one that doth beleeue. *We beleeue*, saith he, *these points and many more, but yee we shall bee neuer the neerer our Saluation, vnlesse we obserue Gods commandements.* But if we beleeue as the Scripture teacheth vs to beleeue, wee are thereby the neerer our Saluation, though we doe not obserue Gods commandements, in that sort, and to that end as he intendeth. For therefore doe we beleeue in Christ, therefore doe we seeke him, take hold of him, eate him, drinke him, digest him, that in him wee may finde the comfort of Saluation, which otherwise we cannot find for want of the keeping of Gods commandements. Therefore saith the Apostle, [c] *Euen we haue beleeued in Christ, that we might be iustified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law,* (not by our keeping of Gods commandements) *because that by the works of the law, no flesh shall be iustified.* And in this respect we are not *vncertaine of performing Gods commandements*, as *M. Bishop* speaketh, but very certaine, that we neuer doe or can performe them, hauing continually cause to *demand pardon of our wants*, and therefore neuer finding any assured trust of Saluation, so long as wee ground it hereupon. But although wee deny any such keeping of Gods commandements, as may serue for the purchase of our iustification and Saluation, yet wee acknowledge a keeping thereof as a fruit of our iustification, and a part of the worke of our saluation, because [d] *we are Gods workemanship created in Christ Iesus vnto good works, which he hath prepared for vs to walke in.* And this keeping of Gods commandements our Sauiour hath recommended vnto vs, as *M. Bishop* alledgeth: and of it *S. Iohn* saith, [e] *He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandements, is a lyar, and the truth is not in him.* But this keeping of Gods commandements, cannot bee seuered from the *finding, and receiuing, and holding, and eating, and digesting of Christ*, because no man receiueth or eateth Christ by faith, but who liueth by him, and in whom he liueth, that he may say, [f] *Not I now, but Christ liueth in me, and that I now liue in the flesh, I liue by the faith of the Sonne of God, who hath loued me and giuen himselfe for me.* Very idlely therefore in this behalfe doth *M. Bishop* tell vs, that by the one we are neuer awhit the neerer without the other, when the one can no where be without the cõpany of the other. Now of this keeping of Gods commandements, and perseuerance therein, true faith, as before hath beene shewed, resteth assured, because

[c] Gal. 2. 16.

[d] Ephes. 2. 10.

[e] 1. Ioh. 2. 4.

[f] Gal. 2. 20.

becauſe God hath ſo promiſed, and ſo farre are wee from being doubtfull of Saluation by any doubt thereof, as that we rather gather hence greater ſtrength of aſſurance, by that wee perceiue the beginning of that good worke of God in vs, whereby he fitteth & prepareth his vnto euerlaſting life.

17. W. BISHOP.

*The ſecond reaſon is*, Whatſoeuer the holy Ghoſt teſtifieth vnto vs, that certainely by faith we muſt beleeue: but the holy Ghoſt doth particularly teſtifie vnto vs our Saluation: *ergo.* The firſt propoſition is true. The ſecond is proued thus: *S. Paul* ſaith, the ſpirit of God beareth witnes with our ſpirit, that we are the childrē of God. The Papiſts to elude this reaſon alledge, that it doth indeed witnes our adoption, by ſome comfortable feeling of Gods fauour toward vs, which may often be miſtaken, whereof the Apoſtle warneth vs when he ſaith, beleeue not euery ſpirit, but trie the ſpirits, whether they be of God or no. But (*ſaith* M. Perkins) by their leaue, the teſtimony of the ſpirit, is more then a bare feeling of Gods grace. For it is called the pledge and earneſt of Gods ſpirit in our hearts. And therefore it takes away all doubting, as in a bargaine, the earneſt giuen puts all out of queſtion. *I anſwere firſt out of the place it ſelfe, that there followeth a condition on our parts to be performed, which* M. Perkins *thought wiſdome to conceale. For* S. Paul *ſaith that the ſpirit witneſſeth with our ſpirit, that we are the ſonnes of God, and coheires of Chriſt, with this condition,* If yet we ſuffer with him, that we may be glorified with him. *So that the teſtimonie is not abſolute, but conditionall, and then if we faile in performance of the condition, God ſtands free of his promiſe, and will take his* earneſt *back againe. And ſo to haue receiued the* earneſt *of it, will nothing auaile vs, much leſſe, aſſure vs of Saluation.*

Rom. 8.

1. Ioh. 4.

1. Cor. 2.

*This is the direct anſwer to that place although the other bee verie good, that the teſtimony of the ſpirit, is but an inward comfort and ioy, which breedeth great hope of Saluation, but bringeth not aſſurance thereof.* This M. Perkins *would refute, by the authoritie of S.* Bernard; *in the place before cited, ſee the place, and my anſwer there.*

Epiſt. 107.

R. AB-

## R. Abbot.

To ſhew that the holy Ghoſt doth particularly teſtifie our adoption and Saluation, and therefore that we are by faith to beleeue the ſame, *M. Perkins* alledgeth the words of the Apoſtle, [a] *We haue receiued the ſpirit of adoption whereby wee crie, Abba, Father. The ſame ſpirit beareth witnes with our ſpirit that we are the ſonnes of God.* Which words ſo expreſſe and plaine, might be ſufficient to ſtoppe the mouthes of theſe brabling ſophiſters, but that they meaſure the portion of Gods children by their owne carnall ſenſe and conceit, and being deſtitute of true faith, and of the ſpirit of God, are no more fit to iudge hereof, then blind men are to iudge of colours. It is apparent that the faithfull haue a teſtimony of the holy Ghoſt, bearing witnes with their ſpirit that they are the ſonnes of God. Let him wreſt and wrie this *teſtimony* while he will, it will not ſerue the turne, vnleſſe hee make it ſuch as whereby the *ſpirite beareth witneſſe with our ſpirit that wee are the ſonnes of God.* Hee ſaith that it is a good anſwere of theirs which M. *Perkins* mentioneth, that *the teſtimonie of the ſpirit is but an inward comfort and ioy which breedeth great hope of Saluation, but bringeth not aſſurance thereof.* But this is no good anſwere, becauſe it is not anſwerable to the words of the Apoſtle, who ſpeaketh of ſuch a witnes of the ſpirit, as whereby it is witneſſed vnto vs, that wee are the ſonnes of God. Let him remember what S. *Auſtin* ſayeth: [b] *where the matter is manifeſt we are not to adde our meaning to the ſenſe of holy Scripture: For this comes not of humane ignorance but of froward and wilfull preſumption.* Here is a plain aſſertion of a witnes giuen to our faith, that we are the ſonnes of God. Now his *comfort and ioy* is but a matter of perhaps, a matter of very vncertaine and doubtfull hope, wherein he confeſſeth it may bee he miſtaketh, and indeed hath no cauſe but to thinke that hee doth miſtake; which notwithſtanding it be had, hee thinketh it a preſumption for a man to perſwade himſelfe, that he hath therby any certaine witnes that hee is the child of God. But [c] *the ſpirit that beareth witnes*, as Saint *Iohn* ſaith, *is truth*, being [d] *the ſpirite of truth*, and therefore being ſent for [e] a *Comforter*, ſurely in comforting hee telleth or teſtifieth nothing but the truth. If then the ſpirit

[a] Rom. 8. 15, 16.

[b] *Auguſt. cont. Iulian li. 5. cap. 2. Vbi manifeſta res eſt ſcripturæ diuinæ ſenſui noſtrum ſenſum addere non debemus: non enim hoc fit humanæ ignorantia ſed præſumptione peruerſa.*

[c] 1. Ioh. 5. 6.

[d] Ioh. 14. 17.

[e] Verſe 16.

ſpirit of God *beare witneſſe to vs that wee are the ſonnes of God*, we know that it is true, and we are ſure that indeede wee are the ſonnes of God. Now this *witneſſe of the ſpirit*, albeit by ſome it be taken to conſiſt in the fruites of ſanctification, as by *Ambroſe* [f] *in leading a life fitting to the name of the ſonnes of God, whereby through the ſpirit the fathers marke is ſeene in vs*: and by *Origen*, in [g] *doing all things (towards God) not for feare, but for loue of him as a father*: and by *Bernand*, [h] *in that God raiſing vs from dead workes doth giue vs the workes of life; in that he calleth vs by feare, and frameth vs to righteouſneſſe by loue*, yet moſt properly is declared by the Apoſtle himſelfe to ſtand in the true ſpirituall inuocation and calling vpon the name of God, whereby vpon all occaſions as children to a father, we make our recourſe vnto him. (i) *Becauſe ye are ſonnes, God hath ſent foorth the ſpirit of his ſonne into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.* When therefore God doth ſend forth his ſpirit into our hearts, crying, and making vs to crie, Abba, Father, the ſame is a witneſſe to our ſpirit that wee are the ſonnes of God, becauſe for no other reaſon doth God ſend forth this ſpirit into our heats, but *becauſe wee are ſonnes*. When God giueth vnto vs this light and feeling that he is our Father, there followeth neceſſarily a certificate that we are his children, becauſe theſe as relatiues mutually depend one vpon another. And this is a certificate and teſtimonie that cannot bee counterfeited, and wherein there is no errour. For neither the ſpirit of man himſelfe nor any other ſpirit can giue him that ſpirituall eye of the inner man whereby to looke vpon God as a Father; that ſincere, and ſingle and pure affection, and inuocation wherewith the faithfull ſoule tendereth it ſelfe vnto God, but onely the ſpirit of God himſelfe. It is no way incident vnto vs to haue in heart and conſcience that familiar and louely acceſſe vnto the throne of grace, [k] *but vpon conſcience of the ſpirit dwelling in vs*, as Saint *Hierome* ſpeaketh. Wee know there is otherwiſe a formall courſe of praying, and wee doubt not but *M. Biſhop* daily mumbleth a taske and ordinarie thereof, as Iewes and Heretikes are wont to do, but that is rather ſaying of prayers then praying indeed: true and faithful praier, and the crying of the heart vnto God, *Abba Father* is a further matter, and a thing peculiar onely to the ſonnes of

f *Ambroſ. in Rom. cap. 8. Dignam vitam huic voci exhibemus, & hoc eſt teſtimonium filiorum, ſi in eis per ſpiritū videtur ſignum paternum.*

g *Origen. ibid. confirmat ſpiritū noſtrum quòd ſumus filij Dei cùm iam nihil inueſt timoris, id eſt, nihil propter amorem patris punam grimus ſed propter cuncta peccauimus.*

h *Bernard. epiſt. 107. Sic reuera ſit vnicus filij ſpiritus teſtimonium perhibet ſpiritus noſtro quod ſimus filij Dei & non cùm ſuſcitamur ex operibus mortuis largitur opera vitæ, &c. vocatus per timorem, &c. ſupra Sect. 15.*

i *Gal. 4. 2.*

k *Hieron in Gal cap. 4. Numquam auderemus dicere Pater noſter, &c. niſi de conſcientiæ ſpiritus habitaret in nobis.*

of God, and this [1] *ſpirit of prayer* a true witneſſe vnto them, that they are the ſonnes of God. But *M. Biſhop* to take away the force of this proofe, anſwereth further out of the place it ſelfe, *that there followeth a condition on our part to be performed, If yet we ſuffer with him, that we may be glorified with him.* Which words the Apoſtle indeed vſeth in the next verſe, but vpon other occaſion, and to other end, then as to impeach or queſtion that teſtimony of the ſpirit, which by an entire and abſolute aſſertion hee hath here expreſſed. For hauing affirmed that *the ſpirit teſtifieth with our ſpirit that we are the ſonnes of God*, he inferreth, *If we be ſonnes, then are we alſo heires, euen heires of God, and ioynt-heires or fellow heires with Chriſt.* Now how this *fellowſhip with Chriſt* is performed, hee declareth by adding thoſe words; *if yet we ſuffer with him, that we alſo may bee glorified with him.* Thus are wee *ioynt-heires* with Chriſt, ſaith he, if we attaine to our inheritance the ſame way that he did, being firſt partakers with him in ſufferings, as wee ſhal afterwards be in glorie. *M. Biſhop* therefore doth amiſſe to tie thoſe words as a condition to the former words, which naturally ſerue for explication of the latter. But admitting the ſpeech to bee conditionall, it doth nothing preiudicate the aſſurance of the faithfull, becauſe thereby God inſtructeth them which way hee himſelfe will bring them to himſelfe, not what hee will leaue them at vncertaintie to doe for their comming vnto him. He expreſſeth a condition, the performance whereof faith expecteth from himſelfe, becauſe [m] *of him it is giuen vnto vs for Chriſts ſake, not onely to beleeue in him, but alſo to ſuffer for his ſake* [n] *being ſtrengthened with all might through his glorious power, to all patience and long ſuffering with ioyfulneſſe.* To this end, as [o] *the ſufferings of Chriſt abound in them*, ſo he cauſeth *their conſolations to abound through Chriſt*, and their [p] *hope ſtedfaſt in this behalfe, becauſe they know that as they are partakers of the ſufferings, ſo they ſhall be alſo of the conſolation*, that the greeuance of the one may bee the more eaſily borne by meanes of the ioy and ſweetneſſe of the other. In a word, faith reſteth vpon that that is written, [q] *He hath ſayd, I will not faile thee, nor forſake thee: therefore we may boldly ſay, The Lord is on my ſide, I will not feare what man can do vnto me.* [r] *He hath predeſtinated vs to be made like vnto the image of his ſonne*, and therefore [s] *hauing*

1 Zechar. 12. 10. Tremel.

m Phil. 1. 29.
n Col. 1. 11.

o 2. Cor. 1. 5.

p Vers. 7.

q Heb. 13. 5. r. Rom. 8. 29.

s Bernard. epiſt. 107. *Habes ſpiritum huius arcani indicem.*

*recei-*

*receiued the ſpirit to reueale vnto vs,* as Saint *Bernard* ſaith, *this ſecret* of his predeſtination, we ſtand aſſured that accordingly he will accompliſh in vs the image of his Sonne, that together with him we may beare the croſſe, and together with him alſo we may weare the crowne, and therefore will ſo order all things, as that there ſhall be [t] *nothing to come that ſhall ſeparate vs from the loue of God which is in Chriſt Ieſus our Lord.* Now *the ſpirit* as he is the reuealer of the ſecret, ſo is he the *earneſt* of the effect of Gods predeſtination, by the gift whereof God giueth vnto vs the certaine aſſurance of all the reſt that remaineth to be giuen. [u] *It is the pledge of the inheritance promiſed, and as a hand-writing* (or bond for aſſurance) *of euerlaſting Saluation,* not vpon vncertaintie, if we do thus or thus, but framing vs to bee and to doe whatſoeuer belongeth to the attainment thereof, *making vs the temple and houſe of God; being the worker of holineſſe in vs, that he may bring our bodies to eternitie, and to the immortalitie of the reſurrection, whileſt in himſelfe he accuſtometh them to be tempered with heauenly virtue, and to be accompanied with the diuine eternitie of the holy ghoſt.* Therefore God doth neuer take this *earneſt* backe againe, becauſe it is ſo [x] *the earneſt of our inheritance vntill the redemption of poſſeſſion* as that it is *an earneſt* alſo that in the meane time *God* [y] *ſtabliſheth vs in Chriſt,* and that [z] *hee hath created vs euen for this thing,* namely to clothe vs with immortality and eternall life. To be ſhort, God in giuing earneſt for aſſurance of the end, doth thereby vndertake againſt all lets and impediments that ſhould hinder the atchieuing of that that is earneſted thereby, and therefore as *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, [a] *the things preſent which thou haſt attained already, do aſſure vnto thee thoſe things that are yet to come.* As for the words alledged out of Saint *Iohn,* that [b] *wee beleeue not euery ſpirit, but trie the ſpirits whether they be of God or not,* as if wee were willed to bee diſtruſtfull of the reuelation and teſtimonie of the ſpirit that wee are the ſonnes of God, leaſt by any falſe ſpirit wee be abuſed and deluded, they are verie abſurdly wreſted and forced to that purpoſe, beeing very apparently a caueat againſt falſe prophets ſpeaking out of their owne ſpirite, and yet pretending the ſpirit of Chriſt, as is verie plaine by the reaſon added in the next

t Rom. 8. 38.

u *Tertul. de Trinit. Hic eſt pignus promiſſæ hereditatis & quaſi chirographum quoddam æternæ ſalutis quo nos Deus faciat templum ſuum & nos eius efficiat domũ: inhabitator corporibus noſtris datus & ſacrificatiũ effector, qui id agens in nobis ad æternitatem & ad reſurrectionem immortalitatis corpora noſtra producat dum illa in ſe aſſuefacit cum cæleſti virtute miſceri, & cuius ſpiritus ſanctã, diuinæ æternitate ſociari.*

x Eph. 1. 13.

y 2. Cor. 1. 21. 22.

z Cap. 5. 5.

a *Chryſoſt. in Rom hom. 9. Præſentia & quæ iam aſſecutus es de futuris tibi fidẽ faciãt.*

b 1. Iohn 4. 1.

wordes, *For many falſe Prophets are gone abroad into the world.* And yet if we admit them as meant of this *teſtimonie of the ſpirit*, they are ſo farre from ſeruing their turne, as that they make altogether againſt them. For if in that behalfe wee bee willed to *trie the ſpirits whether they bee of God or not*, then it followeth that there is a way whereby to trie the ſame. And if there bee a meanes whereby to trie whether the ſpirite that teſtifieth vnto vs that wee are the ſonnes of God, bee of God or not, then there is a meanes for vs to bee aſſured that wee are the ſonnes of God. For if by triall wee finde that the ſpirit that ſo teſtifieth is of God, then becauſe the ſame ſpirit is truth, we cannot make queſtion but that we are indeed the ſonnes of God. So therefore we reſolue of that teſtimony whereof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, whereby *the ſpirit beareth witneſſe with our ſpirit that we are the ſonnes of God.* Bee it that ſome men by falſe opinions and imaginations of carnall ſecurity doe heerein deceiue themſelues, yet as it is no reaſon for a King to doubt whether he be a King, for that franticke and melancholik perſons are falſly ſo perſwaded of themſelues: and as a goldſmith doth not therefore doubt whether gold bee gold; for that ſome vnskilfull man taketh copper in ſteed of gold, ſo no reaſon is it that they who haue receiued the vndoubted teſtimonie of the ſpirit, ſhining vnto them out of the true light of the word of God, ſhould therefore cal in queſtion the truth therof, becauſe many mē are mocked with falſe preſumptions, which they themſelues haue builded out of their owne braines. The teſtimony of the ſpirit is certainely knowne and felt whereſoeuer it is found, neither can any ſpirit worke in any mans heart any liuely counterfeit thereof, as before was ſayd. Therefore it ſtandeth firme and ſure againſt all *M. Biſhops* exceptions, that there is a teſtimony of the ſpirit, whereby according to the meaſure of our faith we ſtand aſſured that wee are the ſonnes of God.

## 18. W. BISHOP.

*The third reaſon is,* That which we muſt pray for by Gods commandement, that wee muſt beleeue: but euery man muſt pray for Saluation; *therefore* we muſt beleeue that we ſhall haue Saluation. *The propoſition hee confirmeth thus: In euery petition muſt bee two things: one a deſire of the thing we aske; another a particular faith to obtaine it, which is proued by Chriſts words:* Whatſoeuer you ſhall requeſt when you pray, beleeue that you ſhall haue it, and it ſhall be done. Mar. 11.

*This Argument is ſo proper for their purpoſe, that we returne it vpon their owne heads:* We muſt pray for Saluation, *therefore we are not yet aſſured of it: For who in his wits, praieth God to giue him that, whereof he is aſſured already? And a godly act of faith it is, in that praier to beleeue that God will giue that, which he is aſſured of before hand: ſuch fooliſh petitions cannot pleaſe God, and therefore after their doctrine it is to bee denied, that any faithfull man may pray for his Saluation, but rather thanke the Lord for it. But to anſwere directly, he who praieth, muſt beleeue he ſhall obtaine that which he praieth for, if he obſerue all the due circumſtances of praier, which be many, but to this purpoſe, two are required neceſſarily: the one that he who praieth be the true ſeruant of God, which firſt excludeth all thoſe that erre in faith, touched in theſe words,* What you of the faithfull ſhall deſire when you pray, ſhall bee giuen you: *The other is, when we requeſt matters of ſuch moment, that we perſeuer in praier, and continue our ſute day by day, of theſe ſutes of eternall Saluation, wee muſt take theſe words of our Sauiour to be ſpoken:* We muſt alwaies pray, and neuer be weary: *and then no doubt, but wee ſhall in the end receiue it. But becauſe we are in doubt, whether we ſhall obſerue thoſe neceſſarie circumſtances of praier or no, therefore wee cannot bee ſo well aſſured to obtaine our ſute, although wee be on Gods part moſt aſſured, that hee is moſt bountifull, and readier to giue, then wee are to aske.* Lake 18.

*But ſaith* Maſter Perkins, S. Iohn *noteth out this particular faith, calling it,* Our aſſurance, that God will giue vnto vs, whatſoeuer we aske according to his will. *But where finde we that it is Gods will, to aſſure euery man at the firſt entrance into his ſeruice, of eternall* 1. Iohn 5.

*Saluation? Is it not ſufficient to make him an aſſured promiſe of it, vpon his faithfull ſeruice and good behauiour towards him?*

R. ABBOT.

The argument is very pregnant and cleere. Chriſt hath taught vs to [a] *beleeue that we ſhall haue that that we pray for.* We are to pray for forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, and eternall life. Wee are therefore to beleeue that we ſhall haue forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, and euerlaſting life. Nay ſaith *M Biſhop, we muſt pray for our Saluation, therefore we are not yet aſſured of it.* He forbare to anſwere ſtrictly by the very termes of the argument, becauſe therein his notable impudencie and wilfull contradiction to the words of Chriſt had very notably appeared. For then he muſt haue anſwered thus, Wee muſt pray for our Saluation; therefore we muſt not beleeue that wee ſhall haue Saluation, directly againſt the words of Chriſt, inſtructing vs to beleeue that wee ſhall haue that that wee pray for. But to take that which hee doth ſay, I anſwere him againe, that our praiing for Saluation, is an argument that wee are not yet aſſured of it by poſſeſſion; but it hindereth not but that wee are aſſured thereof in hope. Wee are not aſſured of it as a thing in preſent, but yet wee are aſſured of it as a thing to come. As for his conceipt, that wee are not to pray for any thing that wee haue aſſurance to obtaine, the folly and blinde ignorance therein bewraied, is ſufficiently diſcouered before in the fifth Section. Wee beleeue the promiſe of God as touching our Saluation, not doubting but that hee will make vs partakers thereof, according to his promiſe, to thoſe that doe beleeue in him, but as yet wee enioy not this Saluation. Hee leadeth vs on in the hope and deſire of it, and by our praier wee vtter our deſire, ſtill reſoluing that hee will effect it, but yet ſtill begging and craiing till hee doe effect it. So then wee thanke God that hee hath called vs to this hope, and we reioyce therein; but ſtill wee begge the accompliſhment of that that hee hath taught vs to hope for. But to leaue this as handled before, hee will further giue vs, as hee ſaith, *a direct anſwere*, and that is, *that hee that praieth muſt beleeue hee ſhall obtaine that which hee praieth for, if hee obſerue all the due circumſtances of praier.* But wee anſwere him, that it is not for the perfection

[a] Mar. 11. 2.

fection of our praiers, that God accepteth vs but for the true affection of our hearts. We many times faile in the due circumstances of praier, and much faintnesse and weakenesse wee shew therein, when yet we beleeue that God mercifully respecteth vs therein by the intercession of Iesus Christ. Now of these circumstances he setteth downe two as necessarily required, the one that he that praieth *be the true seruant of God*: the other that hee *perseuere in praier*. And what of these? Marry saith he, *because we are in doubt whether we shall obserue those necessary circumstances of praier or no, therefore we cannot be so well assured to obtaine our suit*. Behold he is in doubt whether he be the true seruant of God, or not, and we may therein see the blindnesse wherein Popery holdeth men, not discerning the misery of their owne estate. He knoweth no faith but what is incident to diuels and damned men: he cannot tell whether he haue any true hope towards God, any loue, any true repentance, whether he be the true seruant of God, whether God heare or regard his praier, but walketh altogether in the darke, and knoweth not whither he goeth. But true faith yeeldeth a man whereof to say, [b] *Behold, O Lord, for I am thy seruant*: [c] *I am thy seruant, O giue me vnderstanding, that I may keepe thy commandements*. [d] *Enter not into iudgement with thy seruant, &c.* As for *perseuerance in praier*, saith expecteth it also of him that [e] *prepareth the heart*, and [f] *powreth vpon vs the spirit of grace and of prayer*, [g] *which maketh request for vs (that is*, [h] *maketh vs to make request for our selues, and inspireth into vs the affection of praier) with sighes and grones that cannot be expressed*. If the faithfull man in these things depended vpon himselfe, hee should haue iust cause to feare and doubt his owne perseuerance; but hee saith with the Apostle, [i] *I know whom I haue beleeued, and I am sure that he is able to keepe that which I haue committed vnto him against that day*, euen my selfe, my faith, my hope, my praier, my soule, my life, knowing my selfe to be a very vnsafe keeper of my selfe. Yea hee praieth also for *perseuerance*: and because hee is willed *to beleeue that he shall haue that that he praieth for*, therefore hee beleeueth that he shall perseuere, and the word of Christ assureth him that he shall so doe, because he saith; [k] *Beleeue that yee shall haue it, and it shall be done vnto you*. To which purpose Saint *Bernard* well saith: [l] *In the benefits of God, looke how farre thou treadest the foote of thy faith, so*

b Psal. 116. 16.
c 119. vers. 125.
d 143. vers. 2.
e Psal. 10. 17.
f Zach. 12. 10.
g Rom. 8. 26.
h *August. epist.* 105. *Quia interpellare nos facit, & nobis interpellandi & gemendi inspirat affectum.*
i 2. Tim. 1. 12.
k Mar. 11. 24.
l *Bernard. in Cant. ser.* 32. *In bonis Domini quantum fiducia pedem porrexeris, tantum possidebis.*

farre thou shalt possesse. For as *Cyprian* saith, [m] *God giueth to them that beleeue, so much as he that receiueth beleeueth himselfe to receiue.* Hee doth therefore vndoubtedly persuere in faith and prayer, who praying for perseuerance, beleeueth that he shall receiue the same. And this is further confirmed by the words of Saint *Iohn*: [n] *This is the assurance that we haue in him, that if we aske any thing according to his will he heareth vs, and if we know that he heareth vs, whatsoeuer we aske, we know that we haue the petitions that we haue desired of him.* To which *M. Bishop* answereth: *But where doe we find that it is Gods will, to assure euery man at the first entrance into his seruice of eternall Saluation?* Where the limitation that he vseth *at the first entrance into his seruice* before also deliuered, is but an idle tricke of his vagaring wit. For the question is not of assurance at *the first entrance into Gods seruice*, but whether first or last there be any assurance at all. For he denieth whether in the entrance or in the continuance that God by faith doth giue any man assurance of his own Saluation. Or if that be not his meaning, but that though not at the first entrance, yet afterwards God doth by faith giue that assurance, let him tell vs, and we shall be glad that he hath so farre forth forsaken the doctrine of his Romish mistresse. But because that is his meaning, he must acknowledge his absurd folly, in making a shew of exception in words, where hee intended none. As for vs, wee say indeed, that God euen at the very first entrance into his seruice, offereth vs this assurance. For euen at the very first entrance he saith, as he did to the iaylor, [o] *Beleeue in the Lord Iesus Christ, and thou shalt be saued*: and from the beginning our faith as it is greater or lesse, so either strongly or weakely apprehendeth and imbraceth this assurance. And in this assurance wee labour and endeuour to grow, and to goe on [p] *from faith to faith, from* [q] *strength to strength*, till wee learne to stand as it were vpon the battlements of heauen, and to set the world at defiance, saying, [r] *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? Who shall separate vs from the loue of Christ, &c.* But that answere of his is otherwise also a ridiculous and vaine shift. *Where doe we finde that it is Gods will to assure euery man of eternall Saluation?* Marry speaking of them that beleeue, euen in the very place alledged, *M. Bishop*, if you dissemble it not. By other places wee are taught to pray for forgiuenesse of sinnes, for Saluation, for eternall life, and

you

m *Cypr. lib. 2. ep. 6. Dat credentibus tantum quantum se credit capere qui sumit.*

n 1. Ioh. 5. 14. 15.

o Acts 16. 31.

p Rom. 1. 17.

q Psal. 84. 7.

r Rom. 8. 33.

you deny not but that wee are thus to pray according to the will of God. By this place we haue *assurance*, and are taught *to know that we haue the petitions that we desire of him*; and therefore that according to our p aier, we haue forgiuenesse of sinnes, we haue Saluation and euerlasting life. Speake strictly to the point Master *Bishop*, let vs haue no shifting of words. We haue *assurance to know, that we haue what we aske of him according to his will.* It is according to his will that we aske of him forgiuenesse of sinnes and eternall life. We haue therefore assurance, and are to know, that wee haue forgiuenesse of sinnes and life eternall. Master *Bishop* is dumbe, and to this hath nothing more to say; but goeth forward to aske the question, *Is it not sufficient to make him an assured promise of it vpon his faithfull seruice and good behauiour towards him?* I answere him, No, it is not sufficient: For God made that promise by the former couenant, [f] *He that doth these things, shall liue in them*, and it auailed not; [t] *for they continued not in my couenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.* Therefore God made another couenant and promise, not like the former, not conditionall vpon faithfull seruice and good behauiour, but absolute and without exception, the performance whereof should depend wholly and only vpon his mercy; so that he would not expect as of vs, but did vndertake to giue vs and to worke in vs, whatsoeuer faithfull seruice and good behauiour should be necessary thereunto. Therefore he saith, [u] *I will put my lawes in their minds, and in their hearts will I write them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people; they shall all know me; for I will be mercifull vnto their vnrighteousnesse, and I will remember their sinnes and their iniquities no more.* So that although comparing the one part of the worke of our Saluation with another, the latter is vsually tied to a condition of the former, and God accordingly proceed in the execution thereof, yet if we entirely consider the whole, it issueth absolutely out of the purpose and promise of God, who intending the end, disposeth and worketh himselfe whatsoeuer belongeth to the accomplishment and attainment of the end. Inasmuch therefore as true faith expecteth all of God, and *on Gods part M. Bishop* confesseth *we are most assured*, it must follow that by true faith we stand assured of Saluation, because God is neuer wanting to doe that that appertaineth vnto him.

[f] Gal. 3. 12.
[t] Heb. 8. 9.
[u] Vers. 10.

## 19. W. Bishop.

*The fourth reason is*, Whatsoeuer God commandeth, that a man must and can performe. But God commandeth vs to beleeue our Saluation: *ergo*, we must beleeue it.

*The proposition is true, yet commonly denied by all Protestants, for God commands vs to keepe his commandements; and they hold that to be impossible: but to the assumption: That God commands vs to beleeue our Saluation is proued* (saith M. Perkins) *by these words:* Repent and beleeue the Gospell: Spectatum admissi, risum teneatis amici: *Where is it written in that Gospell, beleeue your owne particular Saluation? shew vs once but one cleere text for it, and wee will beleeue it. I doe beleeue in Christ, and hope to be saued, through his mercy and merits, but know well*, that vnlesse I keepe his words, I am by him likened to a foole, that built his house vpon the sands. *Hee commands me to watch and pray, least I fall into temptation: and elsewhere, warneth me to prepare oyle to keep my lampe burning against his comming, or else I am most certaine to be shut out with the foolish Virgins. An hundred such admonitions finde we in holy Scriptures, to shake vs out of this security of our Saluation, and to make vs vigilant to preuent all temptations of the enemy, and diligent to traine our selues in godly exercises of all vertue.*

Mat 7.
Mat. 26.
Mat. 25.

## R. Abbot.

The *proposition*, saith he, *is true*, and yet as he propoundeth and vnderstandeth it, it is not true, nor was euer intended by *M. Perkins* to be true, and iustly is it denied by all Protestants, that wee can performe whatsoeuer God commandeth, as in the next question God willing shall appeare in the handling of that point. But the proposition as *M. Perkins* expresseth it is, *Whatsoeuer wee are commanded in the Gospell, that we must and can performe.* The reason whereof hee taketh from a distinction of the commandements of the law and the Gospell, because the Gospell is the ministery of *spirit & life*, giuing vs to do whatsoeuer it doth command, which the law doth not. Now *M. Bishop* confoundeth Law and Gospell, and maketh the proposition generall and without excep-

tion,

tion, being ſtill deſirous to ſhew himſelfe like himſelfe. But that God in the Goſpel commandeth vs to beleeue the remiſſion of our ſinnes, and life euerlaſting, Maſter *Perkins* ſheweth by the words of Chriſt; *Repent and beleeue the Goſpell*, being the briefe ſumme of the miniſtery and preaching of Chriſt, and the ſame in effect, as if hee had ſaid, Repent you of your ſinnes, and beleeue the tidings that God hath ſent vnto you, of the forgiueneſſe thereof by Ieſus Chriſt, through faith in his name. For the declaring of which point, hee ſheweth, that to beleeue the Goſpell, is not onely generally to beleeue, that Chriſt is a Sauiour, and that the promiſes made in him are true, for then the diuels may bee ſaid to beleeue the Goſpell, and we ſuppoſe that Maſter *Biſhop* hath more wit and grace, then to ſay that Chriſt in ſaying, *Beleeue the Goſpell*, did commend nothing to vs, but what the diuels may doe, and therefore that the repentant is herby willed particularly to beleeue for himſelfe, to haue the forgiueneſſe of his ſinnes by the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt. Which declaration being very effectuall to the point, this Hickſcorner becauſe hee knew not what to anſwere to it, paſſeth ouer with *Spectatum admiſſi?* &c. and *Where is it written in that Goſpell, beleeue your owne particular Saluation? ſhew vs once*, ſaith he, *but one cleere text for it, and we will beleeue it:* euen as the Iewes ſaid of Chriſt, [a] *Let him come downe from the croſſe, and wee will beleeue in him.* Though hee had come downe from the croſſe, yet would they not haue beleeued in him, becauſe they had ſeene him doe greater works then that, and yet they did not beleeue; and euen ſo Maſter *Biſhop*, whatſoeuer is ſhewed him, remaineth ſtill [b] *like the deafe adder, that ſtoppeth his eares, refuſing to heare the voice of the charmer, charme he never ſo wiſely.* But tell vs *M. Biſhop* in what ſenſe it is, that the repentant man is willed *to beleeue the Goſpell?* Do not make *the beleeuing of the Goſpell*, a thing incident to the diuell, becauſe we ſhall then hold you a partaker with the diuell. This you would haue told vs, and not onely haue recited the place, but ſpoken to that that was inferred vpon it, had you not reſolued to play the part of a lewd ſycophant, and ſought to carry the matter with bare words. The *Goſpell is* [c] *the glad tidings of great ioy, that vnto vs a Sauiour is borne*; [d] *vnto vs a child is borne, vnto vs a ſonne is giuen:* [e] *that is, vnto vs that do beleeue.* To beleeue the Goſpell, is to beleeue this, and how doe I beleeue, *vnto vs*, if I beleeue

[a] Mat. 27. 42.

[b] Pſal. 58. 4.

[c] Luk. 2. 10. 11.
[d] Eſay 9. 6.
[e] *Ambroſ. de fide lib. 3. cap. 4. Propheta dicit, Nobis, hoc eſt, credentibus, non incredulis.*

leeue not *vnto me* ? Therefore by *beleeuing the Gospell*, I beleeue that Christ is borne and giuen a Sauiour vnto *me*, [f] *to saue me* being one of his people [g] *from my sinnes, and from the wrath to come*. The Gospell is, that [h] *through the name of Christ euery one that beleeueth in him shall haue forgiuenes of sinnes*; i *euery one that beleeueth in him, shall not perish, but haue euerlasting life*. If I beleeue the Gospell, I beleeue this, and therefore because I beleeue in Christ, I beleeue that I shall haue forgiuenesse of sinnes, that I shall not perish, but haue euerlasting life. If I beleeue in Christ, and yet beleeue not this, that I haue euerlasting life, I beleeue not the Gospell, because the Gospell saith, [k] *He that beleeueth in him, hath euerlasting life*. [l] *He that beleeueth not God*, saith S. Iohn, *hath made him a liar, because he beleeueth not the record that God witnessed of his Sonne, and this is the record, that God hath giuen vnto vs eternall life, and this life is in his Sonne. Vnto vs*, saith he, namely vnto vs that *beleeue in the name of the Sonne of God*; as afterwards he expoundeth it. If then I beleeue in the name of the Sonne of God, and do not beleeue that God hath giuen vnto me eternall life, I make God a liar, in not beleeuing the record that God hath witnessed of his Son. Therefore he addeth, [m] *These things haue I written vnto you, that beleeue in the name of the Sonne of God, that ye may know that ye haue eternall life*. Where is now this pelting Sophister, that asketh vs where it is written in the Gospell, *to beleeue our owne particular Saluation* ? It is written there, where it is written to them that beleeue, *to know that they haue eternall life*. But saith he, *I beleeue in Christ, and hope to be saued through his mercy and merits*. But take heed you lie not, *M. Bishop*, take heed you lie not vnto God. You haue told vs before, that [n] *to beleeue in God, is to loue God with all your heart*, and that you are not *assured of your loue towards him*. How then can you dare to say, that you beleeue in God ? You haue told vs that [o] *hope and charity are seated in the darke corners of the will*, and that you haue but a *coniecture and probable opinion* thereof in your selfe, and why then do you here tell vs an vncertaine tale of you know not what, that you *hope to be saued* through the mercy and merits of Christ? Againe, whereas you say that you hope to be saued *through the mercy and merits of Christ*, you therein againe dissemble with Christ, because notwithstanding the *mercy and merits of Christ*, you hang your Saluation vpon that that you are to merit, and doe for

f Mat. 1. 21.
g 1. Thess. 1. 10.
h Acts 10. 43.
i 1 Iohn 3. 15.
k Ibid ver. 36.
l 1. Iohn 5. 10.
m Vers. 13.
n Sect. 3.
o Sect. 6.

for your ſelfe, and make your owne *Free will* the finiſher and perfecter of that that by Chriſt is only but begun. You will haue the mercy and merits of Chriſt to ſerue to make you able to ſaue your ſelfe; and if you doe ſo, you will thanke your ſelfe, but you will haue nothing further to thanke Chriſt for. And ſo whereas you would auoid to be like *vnto the foole*, you ſhew your ſelfe a foole outright, building ſo, as that you know not whether you build or not; you know not whether you haue any foundation to build vpon, or any matter to build with; you know not if you haue builded any thing, whether the ſame be likely to ſtand or fall, and what is this elſe but to be a foole? As for vs, we know that we muſt keepe his words, that he commandeth vs to watch and pray, to prepare oile to keepe our lamps burning, and ſuch like; but theſe admonitions ſerue not to ſhake our faith, but rather inſtruct and ſharpen it. They doe not propound conditions for vs to performe to make vp the worke of God in vs, but aduertiſements and inſtructions what thoſe lawes are, whereof God hath ſaid, [p] *I will put my lawes in their hearts*, [q] *and cauſe them to keepe my ſtatutes*, faith being hereby mooued to begge of God, [r] *to giue what he commandeth*, and aſſured that he will to the end performe what he hath promiſed: and ſeeing in his viſitations and corrections, his fatherly prouidence and care to effect the ſame, whileſt thereby he awaketh vs out of our ſecurity, and cauſeth vs to make vſe of the admonitions of holy Scripture, to fight againſt the diuell and ſinne, and to exerciſe our ſelues in all godlineſſe and vertue.

[p] Jer. 31. 33.
[q] Ezech. 36. 27.
[r] *Auguſt. de ſpir. & lit. ca. 13. Lege operum ducit Deus, fac quod iubeo: lege fidei dicitur Deo, Da quod iubes. Ideo enim iubet lex vt admoneat quid faciat fides.*

## 20. W. BISHOP.

*The fift and laſt reaſon is this*, The Papiſts teach aſſurance of hope, euen hence it followeth, that he may be infallibly aſſured, for the property of a true and liuely hope, is neuer to make a man aſhamed. *Anſwere. Hope indeed of heauen, makes a man moſt courageouſly beare out all ſtormes of perſecution, and not be aſhamed of Chriſts Creſſe, but to profeſſe his faith moſt boldly before the bloudy tyrants of the world, our hearts being by charity fortified and made inuincible. And this is that which the Apoſtle teacheth in that place: and ſaith before,* Rom. 5.

Vers. 2 *before* that the faithfull glory in the hope of the ſonnes of God, *and doe not vaunt themſelues of the Certainty of their Saluation. This Certainty of hope, is great in thoſe that haue long liued vertuouſly, ſpecially when they haue alſo endured manifold loſſes, much diſgrace, great wrongs and iniuries for Chriſt's ſake for he that cannot faile of his word, hath promiſed to requite all ſuch with an hundred fold. But what is this to the Certainty of faith, which the Proteſtants will haue euery man to be endued with at his firſt entrance into the ſeruice of God: whenas* S. Heb. 6. Paul *inſinuateth, that godly men partakers of the holy Ghoſt, yea after they haue taſted the good word of God & the power of the world to come, that is, haue receiued beſides faith, great fauours of Gods ſpirit, and felt as it were the ioyes of heauen, haue after all this ſo fallen from God, that there was ſmall hope of their recouery?*

## R. Abbot.

This laſt reaſon taken from the doctrine of the Papiſts concerning *hope*, I doe not hold to haue been fitly applied againſt them. For with them, as there is not that faith, ſo neither is there that hope which the Scripture teacheth, neither can they bee ſaid to teach *aſſurance of hope*, who profeſſedly deliuer, that a man muſt alwaies ſtand in feare and doubt of that that hee ſhould hope for, and that he hath no more but onely *a probable opinion* of any thing in himſelfe, whereof to conceiue hope. Therefore the Councell of Trent ſaith, that [a] *as no man may doubt of the mercy of God, and of the merit of Chriſt, ſo euery man whileſt he conſidereth his owne infirmitie and vndiſpoſednеſſe, hath to ſtand in feare of his owne being in grace.* So *Andradius* affirmeth, that their [b] *hope is alwaies ioined and coupled with feare and doubt:* not onely meaning that it is ſo, but alſo that it ought ſo to be, accordingly as Maſter *Biſhop* hath before deliuered, though vntruly, [c] that there are *aboue an hundred texts in holy writ*, whereby to proue, that *the faithfull muſt ſtand in feare of their owne Saluation.* The *Certainty of hope* therefore that Maſter *Biſhop* nameth, by occaſion that it was named to him, is nothing elſe indeed but meere vncertainty, it being a thing ſenſeleſſe to reckon a Certainty, where a man is bound to ſtand in feare. So that their hope is but a conceit of ſelfe-ſeeming probability, whereby they

a Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 6. cap. 9. Sicut nemo plus de Dei miſericordia, &c. dubitare debet, ſic quilibet dum ſeipſum ſuamq; propriam infirmitatem & indiſpoſitionem reſpicit, de ſua gratia formidare ac timere poteſt.

b Andrad. Orthod. explicat. lib. 6. ſub finem. Ita certa eſt ſpes vt ſemper cum metu & dubitatione coniuncta ſit & conuulſa.

c Sect. 10.

they imagine that haply it may be well with them, but yet doubt leſt it be otherwiſe; in no other ſort then vulgarly men talke of *hope*, where they haue but ſmall ground for that they hope. But the *hope* which the Scripture ſpeaketh of is another matter, importing a patient and conſtant expectation of that that wee beleeue wee ſhall receiue. Faith beleeueth the promiſes of God concerning forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, concerning our bliſſe and happineſſe to come. It beleeueth that God vndoubtedly will make good whatſoeuer he hath promiſed, but as yet wee ſee not the effect and performance thereof. Hope therefore expecteth and waiteth, looking for the Lord to reueale his righteouſneſſe, and to make the truth of his word and promiſe fully to appeare, and in this expectation is content with patience to beare the croſſe, and to endure the afflictions and troubles that are incident to the faith and profeſſion of the name of Chriſt. Thus ſaith *Chryſoſtome*, that [d] *what faith getteth in beleeuing, that hope preſumeth of in enduring and ſuffering.* This hope therefore is not vncertaine and doubtfull, but by the direction of faith, fully reſolueth of the accompliſhment of that that it hopeth for. It is not, as *Hilarie* well noteth, [e] *a preſuming of things vncertaine*, but *an expectation of things knowne vnto vs.* For that cauſe is it that Saint *Paul* ſaith, that [f] *hope maketh not aſhamed.* Which Maſter *Biſhop* not vnderſtanding, expoundeth as if the Apoſtle had ſaid, that it maketh a man not to be aſhamed of the croſſe of Chriſt; but Saint *Paul* reſpected a further matter, to ſignifie the infallible aſſurance and Certainty of *hope*, that it neuer putteth a man to ſhame, it neuer giueth him occaſion to bee aſhamed, as hauing hoped for that whereof in the end he is deceiued. [g] *He is aſhamed*, ſaith Auſtine, *that faileth of his hope. Who is put to ſhame but he that ſaith, I haue not found that that I hoped for?* [h] *They that hope*, ſaith Theodoret, *and are deceiued of their hope, doe bluſh and are aſhamed thereof.* Therefore ſaith Saint *Auſtine*, [i] *We are certaine of our hope: for our hope is not vncertaine, that we ſhould doubt thereof.* Yea, ſo are we certaine thereof, as that Saint *Paul* ſaith, [k] *We reioyce vnder the hope of the glory of God*, as being no leſſe aſſured thereof, then if we were already in poſſeſſion of it, as [l] before I ſhewed, that *Chryſoſtome* expoundeth that place farre otherwiſe then here Maſter *Biſhop*

[d] *Chryſoſt. hom. de fide, ſpe & charit. Quicquid fides credendo acquirit, hoc ſpes ſuſtinendo preſumit.*

[e] *Hilar. in Pſal. 64. Spem oportet non ex animi eſſe preſumptam, ne magis ſit incertorum preſumptio quam expectatio cognitorum.*

[f] Rom. 5. 5.

[g] *Auguſt. in Pſal. 36 conc. 2. Confunditur quem fallit ſpes: qui dicit, quod ſperabam non inueni.*

[h] *Theodo. in Rom. cap. 5.*

[i] *Auguſt. in Pſal. 37. Certi ſumus de ſpe: non eſt enim incerta ſpes noſtra, vt de illa dubitemus.*

[k] Rom. 5. 2.

[l] *Sect. 15. ex Chryſoſt. in Rom. Hom. 9.*

*Bishop* doth. Which [m] *confidence and reioycing of hope*, groweth from that which the holy Ghost termeth [n] πληροφορίαν πίστεως, *full assurance of faith*, whereby setting aside the respect of our owne impeachments of our selues, wee beleeue with *Abraham* [o] *vnder hope, euen against hope*, resting vpon his promise who hath taken vpon him to be [p] *the shepheard and Bishop of our soules*, and [q] *is able to doe exceeding abundantly aboue all that we aske or thinke, according to the power that worketh in vs.* Whereby as he hath already wrought in vs the like great worke as [r] *he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead*, in that he hath [s] *raised vs vp, being dead in trespasses and sinnes*, vnto the *life of God*, so we rest [t] *perswaded, that hauing begun this good worke in vs, he will performe it good vntill the day of Iesus Christ.* [u] *Neither is it for any man to aske*, saith Bernard, *vpon what merits we hope for this good, seeing we heare by the Prophet*, [x] *Not for your sakes, but for mine owne sake will I doe it, saith the Lord.* Now Master *Bishop* admitting after his fashion, an vncertaine Certainty of hope, demandeth, *What is this to the Certainty of faith, which the Protestants will haue euery man to be endued with, at his first entrance into the seruice of God?* Where againe we see how prettily Master *Bishop* can busie himselfe with a fether: These termes of *first entrance into the seruice of God*, are but the playing of his braine; hee would faine seeme to say something thereby, when indeed he saith nothing: For not onely at *first entrance*, but in the whole continuance of the seruice of God, hee leaueth a man as a ship in a storme, and hanging betwixt heauen and hell, howsoeuer not doubting, but that God for his part holdeth him fast to draw him to heauen, yet still affrighted lest himselfe should loose his hold, and fall into hell, nay not knowing whether he haue any hold of God, or God of him, because hee cannot certainly know whether he haue any hope, or charitie, or repentance, or praier, which being seated in the darke corners of the will, cannot otherwise then probably be discerned. But as touching his question, *what is Certainty of hope to Certainty of faith?* I answere him, that being truly vnderstood, it maketh much to the prouing of it. For hope goeth not beyond faith, because as I haue said, hope is but the patient waiting for that, which faith beleeueth we shall haue. What faith doth not assure vs we shall haue, we

[m] Heb.3.6.
[n] Cap.10.22.
[o] Rom.4.18.
[p] 1.Pet.2.25.
[q] Ephes.3.20.
[r] Cap.1.20.
[s] Cap.2.5.
[t] Phil.1.6.
[u] Bernard. in Cant ser.68. Non est quòd iam quæras quibus meritis speremus bona, præsertim cùm audeas apud prophetam, Non propter vos, &c.
[x] Ezech.36.22.

we cannot by hope expect and looke for. There can therefore be no Certaintie of hope, but it muſt preſuppoſe a Certaintie of faith, aſſuring vs of obtaining what we muſt hope for. But ſaith Maiſter *Biſhop*, Saint *Paul inſinuateth, that godly men partakers of the holie Ghoſt, and hauing taſted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, yet after all this haue fallen away from God.* But I anſwer him, that he ſaith more of them then Saint *Paul* did, for he calleth them not *godly men*, though haply for the time they ſeemed to be ſo. Men may be partakers of the temporarie gifts of the holie Ghoſt, and may taſt of the good word of God, and of the powers of the world to come, as *Iudas* did while he was yet an Apoſtle, of whom notwithſtanding in the middeſt of theſe gifts our Sauiour ſaith, that [y] *he was a diuell.* The like is to be ſaid of them who ſhall ſay at that day, [z] *Lord haue not we propheſied in thy name, and in thy name caſt out diuels, and done many miracles?* who yet in the meane while, as our Sauiour ſignifieth, haue bene *workers of iniquitie.* And what leſſe can we ſay of *Balaam*, who in the ſpirit ſaw ſo much concerning the ſtate and hope of the people of God, as made him enamoured thereon, and to cry out, [a] *Let my ſoule die the death of the righteous, and let my laſt end, be like vnto his;* [b] *he ſeeth no iniquitie in Iacob, neither doth he ſee any tranſgreſſion in Iſraell;* [c] *how godly are thy tents, O Iacob, and thy habitations, O Iſrael;* who notwithſtanding bewrayed himſelfe to haue a wicked heart, bewitched with couetouſneſſe, willing for mony to haue curſed the people whom the Lord directed him to bleſſe. Men may haue great gifts, and much reuelation and knowledge of the way of truth, and be touched farre with the conceipt of that they know, who yet are voide of true faith and regeneration of the heart, and therefore in the end becauſe [d] *they haue no roote*, doe certainely fall and ſlide away. Whoſe fall, becauſe they neuer truely ſtood, though they ſeemed ſo to doe, is not to impeach or weaken the aſſurance of them to whom God hath giuen by true faith to ſtand indeede. As for that which Maiſter *Biſhop* ſaith of ſuch, that *they haue receiued faith, and great fauours of the ſpirit &c.* it is but his owne commentarie, and wee accordingly regard it. Hee affirmeth of their faith, that which the Apoſtle affirmeth not, and though they receiued ſome fauours of the ſpirit, yet they neuer found the fauour

to

y Iohn 6.70.
z Matth.7.22.
a Numb.23.10.
b Ver.21.
c Cap.24.5.
d Mat.13.21.

e Ephes.1.14. to receiue him as e *an earnest* vnto them of the heauenly inheri-
f Cap.4.30. tance, or by him to *be* f *sealed vnto the day of redemption*, which if
they had, they should neuer being once sealed haue beene vnsea-
g Rom.11.29. led againe, because in this respect g *the gifts and calling of God are without repentance*, and neuer subiect to any change.

CHAP.

## CHAPTER 4.
# OF IVSTIFICATION.

### 1. W. BISHOP.

BEcauſe M. Perkins *ſets not downe well the Catholikes opinion, I will helpe him out, both with the preparation and Iuſtification it ſelfe, and that taken out of the Councell of Trent. Where the very words concerning preparation are theſe*: Men are prepared and diſpoſed to this iuſtice, when being ſtirred vp, & helped by Gods grace, they conceiuing faith by hearing, are freely moued towards God beleeuing thoſe things to bee true, which God doth reueale and promiſe, namely, that he of his grace doth iuſtifie a ſinner through the redemption that is in *Chriſt Ieſus*. And when knowledging themſelues to bee ſinners, through the feare of Gods iudgements, they turne themſelues to conſider the mercie of God, are lifted vp into hope, truſting that God wi be merciful vnto them for Chriſts ſake: and beginning to loue him as the fountaine of all iuſtice, are thereby moued with hatred and deteſtation of all ſins. Finally, they determine to receiue baptiſme, to begin a new life, and to keep all Chriſts commandements. Seſſ. 6. c. 6.

*After this diſpoſition, or preparation, followeth iuſtification, and for that euery thing is beſt known by the cauſes of it all the cauſes of Iuſtification are deliuered by the councell in the next chapter, which briefly are theſe.* The finall cauſe of the Iuſtification of a ſinner, is the glory of God, the glory of Chriſt, and mans owne Iuſtification: the efficient is God: the meritorious, *Chriſt Ieſus* Paſſions: the inſtrumental is the Sacrament of Baptiſme: the onely formall cauſe, is inherent iuſtice, that is, Faith, Hope, and Charity, with the other gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, powred into a mans ſoule at that inſtant of Iuſtification. *Of the iuſtification by faith, and the ſecond iuſtification ſhall be ſpoken in their places.*

*So that we agree in this point, that iuſtification commeth of the free grace of God through his infinit mercies, and the merits of our Sauiours Paſſion, and that all ſinnes, when a man is iuſtified, be pardoned him.*

*The point of difference is this: that the Proteſtants hold, that Chriſts Paſſion and obedience imputed vnto vs, becommeth our righteouſneſſe*

(*for the words of iustice and iustification, they seldome vse,*) *and not any righteousnesse, which is in our selues.* The Catholikes affirme, that those vertues powred into our soules (speaking of the formal cause of Iustification) is our iustice, & that through that, a man is iustified in Gods sight, & accepted to life euerlasting. Althogh as you haue seene before, we hold that God of his meere mercy through the merits of *Christ Iesus* our Sauior, hath freely bestowed that iustice on vs. *Note that* M. Perkins *comes too short in his second rule, when he attributeth the merits of Christs sufferings to obedience; whereas obedience if it had bene without charitie, would haue merited nothing at Gods hands.*

## R. Abbot.

The doctrine of the councell of Trent concerning *preparation to Iustification*, is the very heresie of the Pelagians, as may appeare by that that before hath beene said therof in the question of [a] *Free will*. Out of the *free will* of man only stirred vp and helped by grace, [b] not any intrinsecal or infused, but only outwardly assisting grace, which is no more but what *Pelagius* himselfe acknowledged, they deriue faith, hope, loue, repentance, the feare of God, the hatred of sinne, and purpose of new life, whereby he prepareth and disposeth himselfe to receiue in his iustification another *faith, hope, charitie, and other gifts of the holy Ghost, then to be powred into his soule*. Wherby though they will not seeme so to do, yet in deed they run into the affirming of that, which if *Pelagius* had not denied & condemned, he had bene condemned himself, [c] *gratiam Dei secundum merita nostra dari, that the grace of God is bestowed vpon vs according to our merit*. In which sort *Bellarmine* saith that [d] *faith iustifieth by way of merit*, that *faith in it manner doth merit forgiueneſſe of sinnes*, applying thereto some speeches of *Austine*, which to that purpose were neuer meant. In setting downe the causes of Iustification out of the Councell, he committeth an absurd errour, in saying that the *finall cause of the Iustification of a sinner, is mans owne Iustification*, as if it selfe could be the *finall cause* of it selfe, whereas the councel nameth in steed thereof *eternall life*. Whereas he saith, that they agree with vs in this point, *that iustification commeth of the free grace of God, through his infinit mercies, and the merits of our Sauiours Passion*, he doth but sophisticate and mocke his Reader. For if Iustification be

[a] Sect. 5.

[b] *Coster. Enchirid. cap 5. Hac gratia impulsus tantum & motio spiritus adhuc foris degentis: liberum arbitrium auxilio Dei necdum inhabitantis sed mouentis & adiuuantis se præparat ad iustificationem.*

[c] *August. epist. 106.*

[d] *Bellarm. de Iustificat. lib. 1. ca. 17 Fides iustificat per modum dispositionis & meritimeretur remissionem peccatorum suo quodam modo.*

of

of the *free grace* of God, then it is not of works, according to that of the Apoſtle, [c] *If it be of grace, it is not of workes, otherwiſe grace is no grace.* But he afterwards profeſſedly diſputeth, that his *works of preparation* are the very cauſe of Iuſtification. It were odious to refuſe the name of the *free grace* of God, and therefore formally he nameth it; but by the proceſſe of this diſcourſe it will appeare, that he meaneth nothing leſſe then to make it *free.* That our Iuſtification and righteouſneſſe before God, ſtandeth not in any inward vertues and graces powred into our ſoules, but in the imputation of Chriſts obedience and righteouſneſſe made ours by faith, ſhall be proued vnto him, God willing, by better arguments then he ſhall be able to diſproue. But that we are not to expect much of him for diſprooving, hee himſelfe here ſheweth vs by a ſilly note, in which he telleth vs, that *M. Perkins comes too ſhort in his ſecond rule, when he attributeth the merits of Chriſts ſufferings to obedience; whereas obedience,* ſaith he, *if it had been without charity, would haue merited nothing at Gods hand.* Wherein what doth hee but giue checke to the Apoſtle, in that he ſaith; [f] *By the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous?* For to him he might likewiſe ſay, that he comes too ſhort in attributing to Chriſts obedience, that many by it are made righteous; whereas by his obedience, if it had beene without charitie, many could not haue beene made righteous. But the mans ſimple ignorance appeareth in this diuiding of obedience from charitie, whereas *charity* is the very *mother of obedience,* neither is there any true obedience, but what iſſueth therefrom. And therefore *M. Perkins* well noted, though Maſter *Biſhops* narrow eies beheld it not, that *Chriſt in his obedience ſhewed his exceeding loue both to his Father and vs.* But wee muſt be content to beare with many ſuch idle and bootleſſe notes.

[c] Rom. 11. 6.

[f] Rom. 5. 19.

## 2. W. Biſhop.

*And whereas* M. Perkins *doth ſay, that therein wee raze the foundation, that is, as he interpreteth it in his preface, we make Chriſt a Pſeudochriſt, we auerre, that herein we do much more magnifie Chriſt, then they doe: for they take Chriſts merits to be ſo meane, that they doe but euen ſerue the turne to deface ſinne, and make men worthy of the ioyes of heauen? Nay it doth not ſerue the turne, but onely that God doth not*

*impute sinne vnto vs. We contrariwise do so highly esteeme of our Saviours inestimable merits, that we hold them wel able to purchase at Gods hands, a farre inferior iustice, and such merits as most all men are capable of, and to them do giue such force and value, that they make a man iust before God and worthy of the kingdome of heauen, as shall be proued. Againe, they doe great iniurie to Gods goodnesse, wisdome, and iustice in their Iustification, for they teach, that inward iustice, or sanctification, is not necessarie to Iustification; Yea, their King-leader* Luther *saith* That the iustified can by no sins whatsoeuer (except hee refuse to beleeue) loose their saluation. *Wherein, first they make their righteous man* like (*as our Saviour speaketh*) *to sepulchers* whited on the out side *with an imputed iustice, but within full of iniquity and disorder. Then the wisedome of God must either not discouer this masse of iniquity, or his goodnes abide it, or his iustice either wipe it away, or punish it:* But (*say they*) he seeth it well enough, but couereth it with the mantle of Christs righteousnes. *Why, can any thing be hid from his sight? It is madnesse to thinke it. And why doth he not for Christs sake deface it, and wipe it cleane away, and adorne with his grace that soule whom he for his Sonnes sake loueth, and make it worthy of his loue and kingdome? What, is it because Christ hath not deserued it? So to say, were to derogate from the infinite value of his merits. Or is it for*

Pag. 77. *that God cannot make such iustice in a pure man, as may be worthie of his loue and his kingdome? And this were to denie Gods power in a matter that can be done, as we confesse that such vertue was in our first father* Adam, *in state of innocencie. And* M. Perkins *seemes to grant,* That man in this life at his last gaspe may haue such righteousnes. *If then we had no other reason for vs, but that our iustification doth more exalt the power and goodnes of God, more magnifie the value of Christs merits, and bringeth greater dignity vnto men: our doctrine were much better to be liked then our aduersaries, who cannot allege one expresse sentence, either out of holy Scriptures, or ancient Fathers, teaching the imputation of Christs righteousnesse vnto vs, to bee our iustification, as shall be seene in the reasons following, and doe much abase both Christs merits, and Gods power, wisdome, and goodnesse. Now to their reasons.*

## R. Abbot.

It is truly said by Master *Perkins*, that the Church of Rome in teaching Iustification by workes, doth raze the very foundation of

of Chriſtian faith, and maketh Chriſt but a counterfeit and falſe Chriſt, becauſe as ſaith the Apoſtle, [a] *If righteouſneſſe be by the law, then Chriſt died in vaine.* Therefore peremptorily he denounceth, [b] *Ye are aboliſhed from Chriſt; ye are fallen from grace whoſoeuer are iuſtified by the law.* Yet *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that *they do therein much more magnifie Chriſt then we do.* But I anſwer him, that they do truly magnifie Chriſt, who yeeld him that honour to ſay or teach nothing of him but what he hath reuealed and taught of himſelfe. They do not magnifie Chriſt, who meaſure and deſcribe him by the fooliſh preſumptions of their owne ſhallow and ſhort wits. As for vs, we do not make the effect of Chriſts merits to ſerue onely that ſinne is not imputed vnto vs, as this ſycophant cauilleth, but affirme the ſame to be ſuch, as that for his ſake, and [c] *in him God bleſſeth vs with all manner of ſpirituall bleſſings in heauenly things*, and that [d] *he is made vnto vs of God wiſdome, righteouſneſſe, ſanctification and redemption*, that is, all in all, *that he that reioyceth may reioice* (onely) *in the Lord.* But of his magnifying Chriſts merits, we may rightly ſay as Saint *Auſtin* vpon occaſion ſaid to the Donatiſts, [e] *They are the words of men, extolling the glorie of man vnder the name of Chriſt, to the abaſing of the glorie of Chriſt himſelfe.* Chriſt forſooth *hath purchaſed for them iuſtice and merits of ſuch force and value, as that they make them iuſt before God, and worthy of the kingdome of heauen.* Theſe are gallants that thinke ſcorne to *receiue the reward of heauen as a poore man doth an almes*, but will needs haue whereof to ſay I am iuſt, I haue iuſtly and worthily deſerued heauen. Fooliſh hypocrit, that affirmeth that of the merits of Chriſt, which neither he nor any of his can ſhew to be performed in himſelfe, nay which his owne conſcience controleth by experience of himſelfe. The word of God teacheth vs no ſuch iuſtice or merit: they themſelues finde it not in themſelues; their Ieſuits and Prieſts, to ſay nothing of the reſt, which are the teachers hereof, are men in the eyes of the world notorious for treacherie, for villanie, for coſinage, for vncleane and filthy life, and ſo one by another diſcouered to be; yea and of their followers a great number that prate of their merits, are knowne for extortioners, whoremongers, drunkards, ſwearers, prophane and vile perſons, and yet muſt wee needs beleeue that they are

a Gal. 2. 21.

b Cap. 5. 4.

c Epheſ. 1. 3.

d 1. Cor. 1. 30.

e *Aug. cont. lit. Petil. lib. 2. ca. 84. Verba ſunt hominum extollentium gloriam hominis ſub nomine Chriſti vt gloria minuatur ipſius Chriſti.*

endued with ſuch *iuſtice and merits?* Nay, we rather beleeue that the iuſt iudgment of God is vpon them, to deliuer them vp to ſinne, who thus wilfully yeeld themſelues to ſuch palpable illuſions of *the man of ſinne.* But by this meanes Chriſt with them after baptiſme is no otherwiſe a Sauiour, but becauſe he giueth ſuch iuſtice as whereby it is in their power by *free will* to ſaue themſelues, and by their merits to purchaſe and deſerue heauen. This is it Maiſter *Biſhop*, for which wee iuſtly deteſt you, as wicked peruerters of the Goſpell of Chriſt, and ſubuerters of true faith. Thus in ſeeming to ſet vp Chriſts merits, you pull them downe, and ſet vp your ſelues in ſteede of Chriſt. But the Goſpell teacheth vs to acknowledge Chriſt immediately and wholy our righteouſnes and ſaluation, [f] *in whom* and not in our ſelues, wee *are made the righteouſneſſe of God*, that is, iuſt in the ſight of God, in that his obedience and righteouſneſſe performed and wrought in our name, and for our behoofe, is imputed vnto vs [g] *by faith in his bloud.* But ſo, as that this *ſaluation* to which he entitleth vs by faith in him, conſiſteth not onely in the remiſſion of ſinnes, or in the not imputing thereof, but alſo in [h] *deſtroying the body of ſinne*, and reſtoring in vs the image of God, [i] *in righteouſneſſe and holineſſe of truth*, he hauing giuen himſelfe [k] *to purge vs to be a peculiar people vnto himſelfe*, and [l] *to make vnto himſelfe a glorious Church, not hauing ſpot or wrinkle or any ſuch thing.* And all this Chriſt will effect vnto vs, but he will do it according to his owne will, not according to Popiſh fancie. All this is now *in fieri, non in facto eſſe*, it is begun and in doing, but it is not yet finiſhed and done: it ſhall bee fully perfected at the reſurrection of the dead. In the meane time he bringeth vs not to perfect righteouſneſſe in our ſelues nor giueth vnto vs a full immunity from ſinne, that he may take away from vs all occaſion of reioycing in our ſelues, that as Saint *Auſtine* noteth, [m] *whileſt no man liuing is found iuſt in the ſight of God, we may allwaies owe thankeſgiuing vnto his mercie, and by humilitie may be healed from ſwelling pride*, and [n] *that we may know*, as Saint *Bernard* ſaith, *at that day, that not for the works of righteouſnes which we haue done, but of his owne mercie hee hath ſaued vs.* Now therefore we doe no wrong *to Gods goodneſſe, wiſdome, iuſtice, in our iuſtification*, as Maiſter *Biſhop* fondly chargeth vs, becauſe we teach iuſtifica-

f 2. Cor. 5. 21.

g Rom. 3. 25.

h Cap. 6. 6.
i Ephe. 4. 24.
k Tit. 2. 14.
l Ephe. 5. 27.
m *Aug. de peccat. merit. & remiſſ. lib. 3. cap. 13 Vt dum non iuſtificatur in conſpectu eius viuens, actionem gratiarũ ſemper indulgentiæ ipſius debeamus, & ſic ab illa prima cauſa omnium vitiorum id eſt, a tumore ſuperbiæ ſanctæ humilitate ſeruemur.*
n *Bernard. in Cant. ſer. 50. Vt ſciamus in die illa quia non ex operibus iuſtitiæ quæ fecimus nos, ſed pro miſericordia ſua ſaluos nos fecit.*

iustification in the same sort as God himselfe hath taught it vs, inferring sanctification as an immediate and necessarie effect, but not containing it as an essentiall part. Wee hold sanctification to bee *necessary to iustification* in this sense, that the one cannot bee without the other, and that no man is iustified by the righteousnesse of Christ, who is not also sanctified by the spirit of Christ; but we denie sanctification to be necessarie to iustification in Master *Bishops* meaning, as to bee any cause or matter of it. As for the place of *Luther* wretchedly falsified by him, the true purpose of it onely is to shew the worke of Gods grace to be irreuocable in them vpon whom hee hath set the marke of his election, and hath iustified them by faith in Christ, to whom as Saint *Austine* saith, [o] *euen their very sinnes doe worke for good*, and thereof is made as it were a triacle and *preseruatiue against sinne*; so that, as *Bernard* saith, [p] *though* Dauid *bee branded with the blot of horrible sins, and* Peter *bee drowned in a depth of denying his Master, yet there is none that can take them out of the hand of God*, who because hee will preserue them, therefore preserueth their faith, and continueth in them his spirit of sanctification, and though by occasion they fall, yet they neuer so fal, but that [q] *his seed remaineth in them*, and [r] *his hand is vnder to lift them vp againe*. Now because wee affirme the inward sanctifying of the heart to be alwaies an infallible consequent of iustification, there is no place for that obiection of his, that we make *the righteous man like to sepulchers, whited without with an imputed Iustice, but within full of iniquitie and disorder*. The imputation of righteousnesse both outwardly and inwardly is our iustification before God, and by sanctification the iustified man both outwardly and inwardly becommeth other in qualitie then he was before, so that although sinne in part be still remaining to lust and rebell, yet it is brought into subiection that it raigneth not, and being checked and resisted that it may not bring forth fruit, a man is not by it reputed *full of iniquity and disorder*. But of this sufficient hath beene said [s] before, by occasion of the same cauill in his epistle to the King. Here as he giueth further occasion, we tell him, that that remainder of sin in the regenerate, is *couered with the mantle of the righteousnesse of Christ*, and so *S. Austine*, as we haue seene before, calleth it [t] *peccatum tectum*, sinne

[o] *Aug. Soliloq. ca. 28. Quibus omnia cooperantur in bonum, etiam peccata ipsa.*

[p] *Bernard. de triplici coher. clauor. vincul. & gluttin. Of Certaintie of Saluation. Sect. 9.*

[q] 1. Joh. 3. 9.

[r] Psal. 37. 24.

[s] Sect. 17.

[t] *Aug. de nupt: & concup. lib. 2. cap. 34.*

*sinne couered or hidden.* But saith hee, it is madnesse to thinke that any thing can bee hid from the sight of God. Wee answer him, that God seeth it well enough with the *eie of his knowledge*, but by reason of that couerture *will not see it* with the *eie of his iudgement*: he seeth it with a *discerning*, but seeth it not with a *reuenging eye*, euen as it is said, [z] *He seeth no iniquity in Iacob nor beholdeth transgression in Israel.* But hee demandeth, *Why doth hee not deface it and wipe it away, and adorne the soule with grace? &c.* Hee hath his answer before: I will heere quit him onely with Saint *Austines* words, [y] *God is in hand to heale all, but hee doth it at his owne discretion, and receiueth not of the sicke man an order for his cure.* Againe he asketh, *Hath not Christ deserued it?* We tell him, yes; Christ hath deserued it, and for his merits sake it shall be done, but we must expect the time that God hath appointed for the doing of it. Christ hath deserued for vs to bee wholly freed from mortality, corruption, and death, as before was said, but mortalitie, corruption and death yet continue still. When mortality, corruption and death shall bee abolished, then shall sinne also wholly and for euer be taken away. Last of all hee demandeth, *Is it because God cannot make such iustice in a pure man?* I answer him out of *Tertullian*, [z] *If wee will so abruptly in our presumptions conceiue opinion, wee may faine what we list of God, as if he had done it, because he could doe it. Hee could haue made man with wings to flie, but yet hee hath not done it. You should proone plainely out of the Scriptures that he would so doe.* As for worthinesse, it is but a matter of conceit and fancie. No creature can contend vpon worth with the Creator. If *Adams* worth were such as hee speaketh of, he had beene worthie to bee preserued, and hee may as saucilie dispute with God, that he did him wrong in suffering him to fall. As for that which hee alledgeth as out of Master *Perkins*, *that man in this life at his last gaspe may haue such righteousnesse*, it is a deuice of his owne, neither doth Master *Perkins* say any thing that should yeeld him anie such construction. For conclusion, hee telleth vs, that *their doctrine is better to bee liked then ours, if for no other reason, yet for that it doth more exalt the power and goodnesse of God, more magnifie the value of Christs merits, and bringeth greater dignitie vnto men.* Where the vaine man seeth not, that by the one part of his speech hee crosseth the other. The thing whereto the

[a] *Augustin. in Ps. 31. Nolui aduertere. Tecta quare? vt non videremur. Quid erat Deo videre occulta nisi punire peccata?*

[z] Numb. 23. 21.

[y] *Aug. de nat. & grat. cap. 27. Hoc agit Deus vt sanet omnia, sed agit iudicio suo, nec ordinem sanandi accipit ab ægro.*

[z] *Tertul. aduers. Praxeam. Si tam abruptè in præsumptionibus nostris hac sententia vtamur, quidnon de Deo confingere poterimus, quasi fecerit quia facere potuerit. Potuit Deus pennis hominem ad volandum instruxisse; non tamen quia potuit statim & fecit. &c. Probare aperte debebis ex Scripturis.*

the true doctrine of the Goſpell tendeth, is intirely the honor and glorie of God, but their doctrine forſooth ſerueth to *bring dignity vnto men.* But in that it *bringeth dignitie vnto men,* it detracteth from the glorie of God, whoſe light is moſt cleerely ſeene in our darkneſſe, [a] *his power in our weakneſſe,* his goodneſſe in ſhewing mercie to vs that are euill, his [b] *righteouſneſſe* in the confeſſion of our *ſhame*; the worth of Chriſts merits in the true acknowledgement of our vnworthineſſe and want of merits. God hath appointed vs to be [c] *for the praiſe of the glorie of his grace,* and therefore ſo diſpoſeth, [d] *that no fleſh ſhall reioice in his preſence,* and [e] *that he only may be exalted at that day.* Therefore [f] *when the iuſt King ſhall ſit vpon his throne, who ſhall glorie that he hath a cleane heart, or reioice that hee is free from ſinne?* Our plea then muſt not bee merit and worth, but only [g] *to finde mercy with the Lord.* But the thing that they ſeeke for, as *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, is the *dignity of man,* as indeed it is. They labour to ſet vp their owne righteouſneſſe againſt the *righteouſneſſe of God.* They extoll their owne merit, their owne worth. The merit of Chriſt only yeeldeth matter of grace to their *Free will* to worke vpon, and thereby they worke for themſelues, they merit for themſelues, they ſaue themſelues; but in ſeeking this glory to themſelues, they purchaſe their owne ſhame. What we can allege for *imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſſe vnto vs to bee our Iuſtification,* will appeare in that that followeth.

[a] 2. Cor. 12. 9.
[b] Dan. 9. 7.
[c] Epheſ. 1. 6.
[d] 1. Cor. 1. 29.
[e] Eſa. 2. 11.
[f] *Aug. epiſt. 29. Cùm rex iuſtus ſederit in throno quis gloriabitur ſe caſtum habere cor? &c.*
[g] 2. Tim. 1. 18.

## 3. W. Biſhop.

M. Perkins *firſt reaſon is this,* That which muſt be our Righteouſneſſe before God, muſt ſatisfie the iuſtice of the Law which ſaith, Do theſe things and thou ſhalt liue: but there is nothing that can ſatisfie that iuſtice of the law, but the righteouſneſſe and obedience of Chriſt. *Ergo.* Gal. 5.

*This reaſon is not worth a ruſh, for when hee requireth that our iuſtice muſt ſatisfie the iuſtice of the Law, I demand what Law hee meaneth? If* Moſes *Law, of which thoſe words,* Doe this, and thou ſhalt liue, *are ſpoken; then I anſwer with the Apoſtle,* That you are euacuated, or aboliſhed from Chriſt, that are iuſtified in the law: *that is, he is a Iew and no Chriſtian, that would haue Chriſtian Iuſtice anſwerable to* Moſes *law.* Gal. 5. Gal. 5.

*If*

*If* M. Perkins *would only that men iustified, must bee able to fulfill Christs law, I then grant, that they so be, by the helpe of Gods grace, which will neuer faile them, before they faile of their duties. But saith* M. Perkins: That iustice of man is vnperfect, and cannot satisfie the iustice which God requires in his law, *and proues it out of* Esay, *who saith,* All our righteousnesse is as a menstruous, or defiled cloth. *I answer, that the holy Prophet speaketh those words in the person of the wicked, and therefore are madly applied vnto the righteous. That hee speaketh of the wicked of that nation and of that time, appeareth plainely by the text it selfe. For hee saith before,* But loe thou hast beene angrie, for wee haue offended, and haue beene euer in sinne. *And after:* There is no man that calleth vpon thy name, and standeth vp to take hold by thee. *And although the words bee generall, and seemes to the vnskilfull to comprehend himselfe also, yet that is but the manner of Preachers, and specially of such as become Intercessors for others, who vse to speake in the persons of them, for whom they sue: for if he had reckoned himselfe in that number, hee had lied, when he said,* There is none that call vpon thy name, *when as hee immediately calleth vpon him in most vehement sort for mercie; all which the best learned among them marking, confesse that this sentence cannot bee alleged against the vertue of good workes. Hence gather, how dexterously* M. Perkins *handleth holy Scripture. That which the Prophet spake of some euill men, of one place, and at one time, that he applieth vnto all good men, for all times, and all places.*

Esay 64.

Luther and Caluin on this place.

## R. Abbot.

This reason, saith *M. Bishop,* is not worth a rush, but I am sure that his answer is not worth a rush, as wherein wee may see the absurd blindnesse of these men who take vpon them to be the only masters of the world. *That,* saith *M. Perkins, which must bee our righteousnesse before God, must satisfie the iustice of the Law, which saith, Doe these things and thou shalt liue,* inferring hereof, that because no righteousnesse of ours doth answer the iustice or righteousnesse commanded in the Law, therefore no righteousnesse of ours, but only the imputed righteousnesse of Christ is our iustification before God. For answer to this *M. Bishop* demandeth

mandeth *what law he meaneth*, whether *Moſes law* or *Chriſts law*? But we make to him a counter-demaund, What he meaneth *by Moſes law*, and what by *Chriſts law*? He ſhould more plainly haue declared his diſtinction if he would haue made an anſwer of it; but that that we conceiue of it is, that by *Moſes law* he meaneth the *ceremonies of the law*, by *Chriſts law the morall law of the commandements* commonly ſo called. But had hee ſo little vnderſtanding of the law, as to thinke that of the *ceremoniall law* it was ſaid, *Do this and thou ſhalt liue*? Surely the ceremonies of the law were but [a] *a handwriting againſt vs*, becauſe they were an acknowledgment of vncleanneſſe, and ſinne, and treſpaſſe againſt that law that ſaith, *Do this and thou ſhalt liue*; and becauſe an acknowledgement of ſinne, therefore a conuiction of guilt of death incurred thereby, and yet could yeeld no remedy againſt death, beeing afterwards [b] *diſannulled becauſe of the weakneſſe and vnprofitableneſſe thereof*; ſo farre ſhould wee bee from thinking that of the ceremoniall law it ſhould be ſayd, *Do this and thou ſhalt liue*. The yong man demandeth of Chriſt, [c] *What good thing ſhall I do that I may haue eternall life*? Now look of what law our Sauior anſwereth him, as *M. Biſhop* hath cited before, [d] *If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the commandements*, of the ſelfe ſame law doth he anſwer another to the ſame queſtion, vpon recital of a briefe of the commandements, [e] *This do and thou ſhalt liue*, namely of the morall law, to which it hath reference [f] where it is firſt ſpoken, as appeareth by that that followeth for declaration of it. Of which alſo it is rehearſed by [g] *Ezechiel* the Prophet, and is by the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* further alledged to ſhew the difference betwixt [h] *the Righteouſneſſe of the law and the Righteouſneſſe of faith*. *Moſes*, ſaith he, *thus deſcribeth the Righteouſneſſe of the Law, that the man which doth theſe things ſhall liue thereby*. [i] *The law is not of faith: but hee that doth theſe things, ſhall liue in them*. Of which law hee ſaith; [k] *By the law commeth the knowledge of ſinne*: that it ſaith, [l] *Thou ſhalt not luſt*; that *hee conſenteth to it that it is good*, that *hee delighteth in it as touching the inner man*; that the [m] *ſumme thereof is*; *Thou ſhalt loue thy neighbour as thy ſelfe*, all which doe vndeniably point out vnto vs the morall law, as both [n] Saint *Auſtine* and [o] Saint *Hierome* out of the ſame and ſuch like places haue expreſly affirmed.

b Heb.7.18.

c Mat.19.16.

d Verſ.17.

e Luc.10.28.

f Leuit.18 5.

g Ezech.18.11. 13.&c.

h Rom.10.5.

i Gal.3.12.

k Rom.3 20.

l Cap 7.verſ.7. 16.22.

m Cap.13.v.9. Gal.5.14.

n *Auguſt. de ſpir. & lit.ca.14.*

o *Hieron epiſt. ad Oceſiphont.*

Of

p Gal. 3.10. Of the ſame law therefore he ſaith, p *So manie as are of the workes of the law are vnder the curſe, for it is written, Curſed is euery one that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the law to do them.* And becauſe no man continueth in all, hee concludeth

q Ver. 11. & cap. 3.16. hereof, q *that by the law no man is iuſtified in the ſight of God; that by the workes of the law no fleſh ſhall be iuſtified.* Now of the ſelfe ſame law doth he ſay that which *M Biſhop* hath cited for the cutting of

r Cap. 5.4. his owne throat, r *Ye are aboliſhed from Chriſt whoſoeuer are iuſtified by the law*, thereby teaching vs to reſolue, that Juſtification by Chriſt, and Iuſtification by the workes of the law, cannot poſſibly concurre in one. Now whereas the Apoſtle for auouching Iuſtification only by faith in Chriſt, taketh it for a ground, that no man fulfilleth the Righteouſneſſe of the law, *M. Biſhop* that he may be wholy thwart and croſſe vnto him, affirmeth, that by the helpe of Gods grace men are made able to fulfill the law to bee iuſtified thereby. Againſt which aſſertion, to proone that the Righteouſneſſe of the regenerate and faithfull is not ſuch as that it can anſwer the iuſtice and Righteouſneſſe required in the law, *M. Perkins* alledgeth the common confeſſion of all endited by the Prophet *Eſay:* s *All our righteouſneſſe is a menſtruous or defiled cloth.* For if the righteouſnes commaunded by the law bee moſt exact and perfect, and no righteouſneſſe is performed by vs but what by our weakenes and corruption is blemiſhed and ſtained, then can no righteouſneſſe of ours ſatiſfie the commandement of the law. But *M. Biſhop* anſwereth, that *the Prophet ſpeaketh theſe words in the perſon of the wicked of that nation and that time, and therefore that they are madly applied vnto the righteous.* Where a man would wonder that he ſhould be ſo mad as to imagine that prayer to be vttered in the perſon of wicked men, or that wicked men ſhould make mention of any their Righteouſneſſe vnto God. And as for the time, it fitteth not the age wherein the Prophet himſelfe liued, but was prophetically written in reſpect of a time long after ſucceeding. Hee foreſaw in the ſpirit the deſolation of Ieruſalem, and the temple, and that whole land, and thereupon putteth himſelfe into the perſon of the faithfull, and maketh himſelfe as one of them that ſhould liue at that time. This is very apparent by the Prophets words t *Thine holy Cities lie waſt, Sion is a wilderneſſe, and Ieruſalem a deſert; The houſe of our Sanctuarie and of our glory, where*

s Eſa. 64.6.

t Ver. 10.

our

*our fathers praiſed thee, is burnt vp with fire, and all our pleaſant things are waſted.* This praier then was to ſerue for a direction to the faithfull that then ſhould be, to make their mone vnto God, and to intreat mercie at his hands. And very anſwerable to this propheticall praier is the praier of the Prophet *Daniel*, made preſently at that time. For whereas *M. Biſhop*, to prooue that the Prophet ſpeaketh in the perſon of the wicked, allegeth thoſe words [u] *Lo thou haſt been angrie, for we haue offended, and haue euer beene in ſinne*, the Prophet *Daniel* likewiſe ſaith, [x] *We haue ſinned, and haue committed iniquity and done wickedly*; [y] *O Lord righteouſneſſe belongeth vnto thee, and vnto vs open ſhame*: [z] *Wee haue not obeied the voice of the Lord our God, to walke in his waies, &c.* And whereas he allegeth the other words, [a] *There is no man that calleth vpon thy name, and ſtandeth vp to take hold of thee*, the Prophet *Daniel* in like ſort ſaith: [b] *Wee haue not made our praier before the Lord our God.* Both of them ſay, *Wee haue offended, We haue ſinned, We haue not praied*, as ſhewing plainely that they ſo ſpake of other men as that they implied themſelues alſo. Nay ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *that is but the manner of Preachers, and ſpecially of ſuch as become Interceſſours for others, who vſe to ſpeake in the perſons of them for whom they ſue.* Where he maketh the holy Prophets and ſeruants of God as very hypocrites to God as hee himſelfe is, as if they tooke vpon them to accuſe themſelues to God when they intended nothing leſſe. But to driue him out of this hole, the Prophet *Daniel* ſaith of himſelfe, that in that praier [c] *hee confeſſed his owne ſinnes, and the ſinnes of his people*, and why ſhould *Daniel* the Prophet be ſaid to confeſſe *his owne ſinnes*, and not the Prophet *Eſay*, or thoſe iuſt and faithfull in whoſe perſon *Eſay* ſpake? Nay both the one and the other ſpake out of the true affection of the faithfull at all times, who alwaies finde in themſelues defects and defaults, wherby they find iuſt cauſe in confeſſion of ſinnes to ioine themſelues with other men, euen as the Prophet *Eſay* elſewhere doth: [d] *Woe is mee: I am a man of polluted lippes, and I dwell in the middeſt of a people of polluted lippes.* But ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *if hee had reckoned himſelfe in that number, he had lied in ſaying, There is none that calleth vpon thy name, becauſe he immediately calleth vpon him in moſt vehement ſort.* As if they in whoſe name the Prophet ſpeaketh,

[u] Eſa. 64. 5.
[x] Dan. 9. 5.
[y] Ver. 7.
[z] Ver. 10.
[a] Eſa. 64. 7.
[b] Dan. 9. 13.
[c] Dan. 9. 20.
[d] Eſa. 6. 5.

ſpeaketh, might not without a lie by words of the preſent time deplore the vniuerſall neglect of calling vpon God, which had beene amongſt them, as *Daniel* acknowledgeth, and for the moſt part continued ſtill, though God had ſtirred vp ſome of their harts now to make ſupplication vnto him: or as if they that did pray might not find in themſelues that faintneſſe and want of heart and ſpirit, as might cauſe them in this behalfe to accuſe themſelues vnto God. Wee cannot doubt but that there were many faithfull and godly amongſt the Iewes in that time of their deſolation, yet in thoſe faithfull and godly there was that default to be found, as that God ſaid of them, [e] *There is none to guide her among all the ſonnes that ſhee hath brought forth; there is none that taketh her by the hand of all the ſonnes that ſhee hath brought vp.* In a word, the Prophet in ſaying, *There is no man that calleth vpon thee*, might note a publike contempt of calling vpon God, without exception againſt himſelfe, as where he ſaith, [f] *No man calleth for iuſtice, no man contendeth for truth*, and ſuch like, and yet could not ſay, *Wee haue ſinned, wee haue all beene as an vncleane thing*, without intendment of himſelfe. Laſt of all, hee allegeth that *the beſt learned among vs* (quoting *Luther* and *Caluin* on this place) *doe confeſſe that this ſentence cannot bee alledged againſt the vertue of good workes.* What *Luther* ſaith vpon the place, I know not, not hauing the booke at hand, but [g] otherwhere hee doth allege it againſt the vertue of good workes. *Caluin* giueth his opinion, that it doth not ſo properly ſerue to that purpoſe, but his reaſon is of leſſe waight, then that it ſhould take from vs a proofe in the very words ſo cleere and pregnant as this is. But if *Luther* and *Caluin* on our ſide doe denie it, let him take [h] *Pighius* and [i] *Ferus* of his owne ſide confeſſing and acknowledging that this place doth make againſt the vertue of good workes, both of them alleging it for an argument againſt the perfection thereof. Or if they beare no ſway with him, let him heare them whoſe authoritie hee may not well diſclaime. *Origen* ſaying thus, [k] *Who will glorie concerning his Righteouſneſſe, ſeeing hee heareth God ſaying by the Prophet, All your Righteouſneſſe is as a cloth of a menſtruous woman:* *Hierome* thus, [l] *By thy mercie wee ſhall bee ſaued,*

[e] Eſa. 51. 18.

[f] Eſa. 59. 4.

[g] *Aſſert. artic. 31*

[h] *Pigh. contron. de fide & iuſtificat.*

[i] *Ferus in Mat. cap. 20.*

[k] *Orig. in Rom. cap. 3. Quis vel ſuper iuſtitia ſua gloriabitur cùm audiat Deum per Prophetam dicentem, quia omnis iuſtitia veſtra ſicut pannus mulieris menſtruate.*

[l] *Hieron. in Eſa. cap. 64. Quicquid videmur habere iuſtitiæ, panno menſtruate mulieris comparatur.*

*ned, vvho by our ſelues are vncleane, and whatſoeuer Righteouſneſſe we ſeeme to haue, it is compared vnto a menſtruous cloth.* Saint *Auſtine* alluding to the ſame place, ſayeth: [m] *Whatſoeuer hee toucheth that is vncleane, by the law it ſhall bee vncleane. But wee all as the cloth of a menſtruous woman, beeing come of an vncleane and corrupt maſſe, doe carrie in our foreheads the blot of our vncleanneſſe, which from God that ſeeth all things wee cannot hide*, thereby acknowledging that blot remaining in vs which muſt needes ſtaine whatſoeuer proceedeth from vs. But Saint *Bernard* is moſt frequent both in affirming this ſtaine of all our Righteouſneſſe, and in applying this place to the proofe thereof. [n] *What can all our righteouſneſſe be*, ſaith hee, *in the ſight of God? ſhall it not as the Prophet ſayth be reputed as a menſtruous (or defiled) cloth, and ſhall not our iuſtice, if it be ſtrictly iudged, bee found vniuſt and ſcant?* And in another place: [o] *Our baſe Righteouſneſſe, if it bee any, is right perhaps, but not pure, vnleſſe haply we thinke our ſelues better then our fathers, vvho no leſſe truly then humbly ſayd, All our righteouſneſſe is as a defiled cloth.* Againe, in another place hee ſaith likewiſe: [p] *All our verie Righteouſneſſes beeing looked vpon by the light of truth, are found as a menſtruous cloth.* Againe, [q] *Our perfect and ſecure reioycing is when we are afraide of all our workes, as holy Iob witneſſeth of himſelfe, and vvith the Prophet Eſay doe knowe that all our Righteouſneſſe is to be no otherwiſe reputed but as a defiled cloth.* Hereby them let *M. Biſhop* now vnderſtand that *M. Perkins* dealt no otherwiſe but dexterouſly in the handeling of this place, and that that which the prophet *Eſay* ſpake, did ſo concerne the faithfull of that time and place whereof he ſpake, as that they haue true application to the faithfull of all times and in all places, becauſe no reaſon can bee giuen why the faithfull of one time ſhould ſo ſpeake, but by the ſame it is enforced vpon the faithfull of all times.

[m] *Auguſt. ſo'loq. ca. 28. Nos omnes quaſi pannus menſtruatæ de maſſa corrupta & immunda venimus: maculam immunditiæ noſtræ in frontibus portamus, &c.*

[n] *Bernard. in Feſt. omn. ſanct. ſerm. 1. Quid poteſt eſſe omnis iuſtitia noſtra coram Deo? Nonne iuxta Prophetam velut pannus menſtruatæ reputabitur, & ſi diſtrictè iudicetur iniuſta inuenietur? omnis iuſtitia noſtra & minus habens.*

[o] *Idem de verb. Eſa. ſerm. 5. Noſtra (ſiqua eſt) humilis iuſtitia recta forſitan ſed non pura; niſi forte meliores nos eſſe credimus quàm patres noſtros, qui non minus veraciter quàm humiliter ſe habent: Omnes iuſtitiæ &c.*

[p] *Idem in dedicat. eccle. ſer. 5. Ipſæ iuſtitiæ noſtræ omnes ad lumen veritatis inſpectæ velut pannus menſtruatæ inueniuntur.*

[q] *Idem ve verb. Apoſt. Qui gloriatur, &c. Perfecta & ſecura latitia eſt cùm veremur omnia opera noſtra, &c. Et cum Eſaia Prophetâ omnes iuſtitias noſtras non aliud quàm pannum menſtruatæ reputandas eſſe cognoſcimus.*

## 4. W. Bishop.

1 Cor. 4. *But he will amend it in the next, where he proues out of Saint* Paul, *that a cleare conſcience (which is a great part of inherent iuſtice,) can nothing helpe to our iuſtification:* I am priuie to nothing in my ſelfe, and yet I am not iuſtified thereby. *Here is a verie pretie peece of coſinage. Woat, doth the Apoſtle ſay that he vvas not iuſtified by his clere conſcience? nothing leſſe: but that albeit, he ſavv nothing in himſelfe to hinder his Iuſtification, yet God who hath ſharper eye ſight, might eſpie ſome iniquitie in him, and therefore durſt not the Apoſtle affirme himſelfe to be iuſtified, as if he ſhould ſay, if there bee no other fault in me in Gods ſight, then I can find by mine owne inſight, I am iuſtified, becauſe I am guiltie of nothing, and ſo the place proueth rather the vncertaine knowledge of our Iuſtification, as I haue before ſhewed.*

*But* M. Perkins *addeth, that we muſt remember, that we ſhall come to iudgement, where rigour of iuſtice ſhall be ſhewed. We know it well, but when there is no condemnation to thoſe that by Baptiſme bee purged from Originall ſinne, as he confeſſeth himſelfe the Apoſtle*
Pag. 18. *to teach in our conſents, about Originall ſinne, vvhat then needeth any iuſtified man greatly feare the rigorous ſentence of a iuſt Iudge? And Saint* Paul *ſaith himſelfe in the perſon of the iuſt:* That hee had runne a good race &c. and therefore, there was a crowne of iuſtice laid vp for him, by that iuſt Iudge, and not onely to him, but all them that loue Chriſts comming. *And concerning both, Inherent Iuſtice and the ability of it, to fulfill the law, and what law, heare this one ſentence of S.* Auguſtine.

*Serm. 28. de verb. Apoſt.* Hee that beleeueth in him, he hath not that iuſtice which is of the law, albeit the law be good, but he ſhall fulfill the law, not by iuſtice which hee hath of himſelfe, but which is giuen of God, for charitie is the fulfilling of the law, and from him is this charity powred into our hearts, not certainly by our ſelues, but by the holy Ghoſt which is giuen vs.

## R. Abbot.

There is none ſo ready to call *harlot* as is the *harlot*, none ſo ready

readie to obiect cosinage to another as he that is the cosiner himselfe. I pray thee, gentle Reader, whether wilt thou rather thinke to be the cosiner, him that saith that the Apostle, saying, *I am not thereby iustified*, doth meane as he saith, *I am not thereby iustified*, or him that wil make thee beleeue that the Apostle thereby meaneth, I cannot tell whether I be iustified or no. Indeed cosiners commonly vse colours, and labour for craftie and cleanely conueiance, but *M. Bishop* is none of those that make daintie of the matter; he sticketh not in euery mans sight to cut the purse: that which in euery mans eies is expresly denied, he maketh no bones at all to turne into a matter of question and doubt. The place hath beene sufficiently handled in the former question, [a] *Of the Certaintie of Saluation*; heere I will onely set downe what *Gregorie* Bishop of Rome conceiued of this place. [b] *Oft times*, saith hee, *our very Righteousnesse being brought to the examination of the Righteousnesse of God is vnrighteousnesse, and it is loathsome in the severitie of the Iudge, which in the opinion of the worker shineth bright. Whereupon Saint Paul when hee said, I am guilty to my selfe in nothing, by and by added, but I am not iustified thereby: who forthwith insinuating the cause why hee was not iustified, saith, But hee that iudgeth me is the Lord.* [c] *As if hee should say, Therefore doe I denie my selfe to bee iustified by my being guiltie of nothing, because I know my selfe to bee more neerely sifted by him that iudgeth mee, &c.* [d] *Because euen our perfection is not without fault, vnlesse the severe Iudge doe with mercie weigh it in the strict ballance of his examination.* Againe hee saith of the same place: [e] *Beholding the strictnesse of Gods iustice, wee are iustly afraid of those very workes, which we thought we did with strength. For our Righteousnesse being brought to the internal rule, if it find seuere iudgement, by many creekes of wrynges and turnings offendeth against the most inward (or perfect) Righteousnesse. Whence the Apostle Paul seeing himselfe to haue the bones* (that is, euen the strength) *of vertues, and yet those bones of his did tremble at strict examination, saith, I am guilty to my selfe in nothing, yet am I not thereby iustified.* [f] *As if hee should say, I remember I haue done the things that bee right, but yet I presume not of any merit, because our life is brought to the censure of him before whom the very bones of our strength are troubled.* Thus by the iudge-

a *Sect.* 12.

b *Greg. Moral. lib. 5. cap. 8. Sape ipsa iustitia nostra ad examen diuina iustitiæ deducta iniustitia est, & sordet in districtione iudicis quod in æstimatione fulget operantis.*

c *Aesi dicat: Idcirco in eo quòd nihil mihi conscius sum iustificat illum me abnego, quia ab eo qui me iudicat examinari me subtiliùs scio.*

d *Quia & ipsa nostra perfectio culpa non caret, nisi hanc seuerus iudex in subtili lance examinis misericordia perpendat.*

e *Ibid. cap. 23. Districtionem diuinæ iustitiæ contemplantes etiam de ipsis operibus iure pertimescimus quæ nos fortia esse putabamus. Ducta namque ad internam regulam nostra rectitudo si districtum inducium inuenit, multis tortitudinis suarum finibus in intimam rectitudinem impingit.*

f *Aesi dicerat, Recta egisse me recolo, attamen de meritis non præsumo; quia ad*

*dium examen vita nostra ducitur sub quo nostra fortitudinis & ossa turbantur.*

ment of him whoſe iudgement *M. Biſhop* by no meanes may refuſe. *S. Paul* plainely denieth himſelfe to bee iuſtified, becauſe though he knew nothing by himſelfe, yet he had to do with him, who in his very beſt workes, much more in many ſecret ſinnes, could find ſufficient to condemne him. And this is the true meaning of thoſe words, that howſoeuer a man, if it bee ſo, know nothing by himſelf, yet the Lord hath matter enough againſt euery man, that he may be iuſtified in that which he hath ſaid, [g] *that no man liuing ſhalbe iuſtified in his ſight.* But yet the ſame Apoſtle who here ſaith of himſelf, *I know nothing by my ſelf*, namely as touching any vnfaithfulneſſe in the ſtewardſhip that God had committed vnto him, which was the matter ſpoken of, yet in other reſpect found cauſe to ſay of himſelfe, [h] *I am carnall; ſold vnder ſinne*; [i] *I do not the good which I would, but the euill which I would not, that doe I.* [k] *I ſee another law in my members, rebelling againſt the law of my mind, and leading me captiue to the law of ſinne that is in my members. O wretched man that I am, who ſhall deliuer me from the body of this death!* So that heere is a further fault committed by *M. Biſhop*, in that he vrgeth the words of the Apoſtle as ſimply and generally true, which were meant onely reſpectiuely, as if he had abſolutely ſaid that he knew nothing at all againſt himſelfe, when he meant it as touching any default in his ſeruice and charge that Chriſt had impoſed vpon him. Now *M. Perkins* to take away the opinion of our owne Righteouſneſſe, and to ſhew that wee haue no other but the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt to reſt ſafelie vpon, allegeth, as *Gregory* doth, the rigour and ſeuerity of Gods iudgment, which admitteth of nothing but what is exact and perfect, according to the rule of iuſtice preſcribed vnto vs. Where *M. Biſhop* ſheweth himſelfe a very ſtupide and ſenſeleſſe man, not mooued with the [l] *terrours of the Lord*, and the dread of that iudgement which the very Angels tremble at. *We know it well*, ſaith he. Yea doe? but what is then your refuge & defenſe? Marry, *ſeeing there is no condemnation to them that by Baptiſme be purged from Originall ſinne, as*, ſaith he, *M Perkins himſelfe confeſſeth the Apoſtle to teach, what then needeth any iuſtified man greatly feare the rigorous ſentence of a iuſt Iudge?* Wherein hee notably abuſeth *M. Perkins* for the hiding of his owne ſhame. For neither the Apoſtle, nor *M Perkins* doe teach, that by *Baptiſme we are purged from Originall ſinne*, but

g Pſal. 143. 2.

h Rom. 7. 14.

i Verſ. 19.

k Verſ. 23.

l 2. Cor. 5. 11.

but onely that in baptiſme it is remitted and pardoned, ſo that though it continue ſtill in vs, yet the faithfull are not thereby holden guilty before God. So then by forgiueneſſe of ſinnes through the imputation of Chriſts merits and obedience, it is that *there is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt*, it is not for that there is nothing in them for which otherwiſe they might iuſtly be condemned. Surely they that righly know themſelues, do know that in themſelues there is that ſtill being, for which God might iuſtly caſt them away, if he ſhould iudge thē in themſelues, but their comfort & hope is that for Chriſts ſake it is not imputed vnto them, that they ſhall ſtand before Gods iudgement ſeate in the veile of his innocency and moſt perfect Righteouſneſſe, and in him ſhal haue eternal life adiudged vnto them. But with *M. Biſhop* the caſe is farre otherwiſe. *There is no condemnation*, becauſe there is nothing worthy of condemnation, all iuſtice, all innocencie, no impurity or vncleanneſſe, *no more ſinne then was in Adam in the ſtate of innocency*, as he hath [m] before ſpoken in the queſtion of *Originall ſinne*. May wee not maruell that an hypocrite ſhould thus ſecurely flatter himſelfe, being occaſioned to bethinke himſelfe of that dreadfull and fearefull day? *We are purged from Originall ſinne*, ſaith he: *vvhat needes then any iuſtified man greatly to feare the rigorous ſentence of a iuſt iudge?* But farre otherwiſe thought Saint *Auſtine* when hee ſayd, as wee heard before, [n] *When the iuſt king ſhall ſit vpon his throne, who ſhall glorie that he hath a cleane heart, or that hee is free from ſinne? What hope then is there*, ſaith he, *vnleſſe mercie bee exalted aboue iudgement?* And what? in the reſt of his life hath the iuſtified man no cauſe *greatly to feare the rigorous ſentence of a iuſt iudge?* no ſinne, no treſpaſſe, for the *rigorous ſentence of a iuſt iudge* to take any hold of? Wee haue ſeene before, that our beſt workes will not endure ſeueritie of iudgement, how ſhall wee then quaile by reaſon of our ſinnes? *S. Auſtin* ſaith very well, [o] *Whoſo liueth heere, howſoeuer iuſtly hee liue, wo vnto him if God enter into iudgment with him.* And fully anſwerable hereunto is that which *Gregorie* ſaith, [p] *Not the very elect howſoeuer they excell in iuſtice, ſhal be able to approue themſelues innocent if they bee narrowly ſifted in iudgement.* But moſt effectual to the purpoſe is that of *Hierome*, [q] *When the day of iudgement or of death ſhall come, all hands ſhall be diſſolued, becauſe there ſhal no work be foūd worthie*

m *Sect.* 10.
n *Auguſt. epiſt.* 29. *Cum rex iuſtus ſedebit in thro no, quis gloriabitur ſe caſtū habere cor, aut quis gloriabitur ſe eſſe immunem à peccato? Quæ igitur ſpes eſt niſi ſuperexultet miſe recordia iudicio?*
o *Aug. in Pſal.* 42. *Quicunque hic viuit, quantūlibet iuſte viuat væ illi ſi cum illo in iudicium intrauerit Deus.*
p *Greg. Moral. li.* 8. *c.* 21. *Quantalibet iuſtitia pollent, nequaquā ſibi ad iuſtitiam vel electi ſufficient ſi diſtrictè in iuditio requiramtur.*
q *Hieron. in Eſa. l.* 6. *c.* 13. *Quum die iudicij vel dormitionis admerit, diſſoluentur omnes manus, quia nullum opus dignum Dei iuſtitia reperietur, &c.*

*Omne quoque cor, ſiue anima hominis tabeſcet & paucibit conſcientia peccati ſui.*

*vvorthie of the iustice of God, neither shall any man liuing bee iustified in his sight. Whereupon the Prophet saith, O Lord, if thou markest iniquities, who shall endure it? euery heart and soule of man shall faint and feare by reason of the conscience of his owne sinne.* And will *M. Bishop* notwithstanding say, *what needeth any iustified man greatly feare the rigorous sentence of a iust iudge?* The best is, that he leaueth no man to make vse of that which he sayeth, because he will giue no man leaue to assure himselfe that he is iustified. Yea to make his matter good, hee alledgeth that Saint *Paul* saith, that *he had runne a good race, &c. and therefore there was a crowne of iustice layed vp for him by that iust iudge, &c.* Of which place we would gladly haue knowne how he maketh application to his purpose. The Apostle maketh mention of *a crowne of iustice layed vp for him, and to be rendered vnto him by a iust iudge,* but he doth not say that he needeth not to feare *the rigorous sentence of a iust iudge.* God is *a iust iudge* as well when he iudgeth by lawes of mercie, as when he iudgeth by lawes of extremitie; as well in the [r] *law of faith*, as in *the law of works*; but the *rigorous sentence of this iust iudge* is onely when he iudgeth by *the law of workes.* By the *law of faith* God forgiueth and pardoneth, he considereth with fauour, and [f] *if there be a willing mind it is accepted according to that a man hath, not according to that that he hath not,* and all this he doth as *a iust iudge*, because by *law* he doth what soeuer he doth. But in the *rigor of the law* which is *the law of workes*, he remitteth nothing but requireth all to [t] *the vttermost farthing*; nothing pleaseth but v/hat is exact, and perfect, and fully answerable to the rule. S. *Paul* then expected that God *as a iust iudge* would yeeld vnto him *the crowne*, not by *the law of workes*, but by *the law of faith*, wherein God [u] *croweneth in mercy and louing kindnesse*, because this *crown is a crowne of iustice*, [x] *not of Pauls owne iustice*, saith S. *Bernard*, *but of the iustice of God. For it is iust with God to pay that he oweth, and he oweth that which he hath promised. And this is the iustice*, saith he, *vpon which the Apostle presumeth, euen the promise of God.* Now verie much doth *M. Bishop* mistake, to thinke that God rendereth *by the rigorous sentence of a iust iudge*, that which as *a iust Iudge* hee rendereth by promise a cording to the law of faith. In a word it toucheth the Apostle *Paul*, which Saint *Austine* sayeth vnto God: [y] *If thou wilt deale as a rigorous iudge, and not as a mercifull*

[r] Rom. 3. 27.

[f] 2. Cor. 8. 12.

[t] Mat 5. 26.

[u] Psal. 103. 4.

[x] Bernard. de grat. & lib. arbit. sub finem. Corona iustitia Dei non fuit. Iustum est quippe vt reddas quod debet: debet autem quod pollicitus est. Et hoc est iustitia de qua presumit Apostolus, promissio Dei.

[y] Aug. confess. in Psal. 129. Si nobiscum seueris iudex aegre volueris, non misericors pater, quis stabit ante oculos tuos?

*mercifull Father, who shall stand in thy presence?* The place of *Austin* by him cited maketh nothing at al against vs, nor helpeth him at all. He would thereby proue *inherent iustice*, and we deny it not; only we say, that in this life we are farre from the perfection of it. In this life we are [z] *trauellers to it, not dwellers in it, not possessors of it.* as Saint *Austin* speaketh in the same Sermon, misquoted by *M. Bishop*, the eighteenth for the fifteenth. [a] *I thinke it is all one, for a man to say, I am iust*, saith he, *as to say, I am no sinner*; and who is there liuing that can so say? Therefore aduisedly he saith, *implebit legem, he shall fulfill the law, not, he doth fulfill.* He now fulfilleth it in part, but shall perfectly fulfill it when charity shall bee perfect, which is [b] *the fulfilling of the law*, which [c] *shall bee in no man so long as hee liueth heere.* Therefore in another place hee bringeth in the Apostle himselfe, saying, [d] *My weakenesse fulfilleth not the law, but yet my will commendeth the law*, referring it to the commandement, *Thou shalt not lust.* This is the state of our Righteousnesse here, rather a desire to fulfill the law, then any perfect attainment of our desire. And thus *M. Bishops* answer to the first argument is indeed not worth a rush.

z *August de verb. Apost. ser. 15. Viatores, non habitatores, non possessores.*
a *Ibid ser. 16. Puto hoc esse dicere, Iustus sum, quod est, peccator non sum.*
b Rom. 13. 10.
c *Aug. epist. 29. Plenissima charitas quamdiu hic homo vivit est in nemine.*
d *Idem de verb. Apost. ser. 5. Non implet legem infirmitas mea sed laudat legem voluntas mea.*

## 5. W. BISHOP.

*Now to the second argument.* Hee which knew no sinne, was made sinne for vs, that we might be made the Righteousnesse of God, which is in him: *Hence* M. Perkins *reasoneth thus:* As Christ was made sinne for vs, so we are made the Righteousnesse of God in him: but Christ was made sinne by imputation of our sinnes, he being most holy: Therfore a sinner is made righteous, in that Christs Righteousnesse is imputed vnto him. *I denie both propositions; the former, because it hath a comparison in the manner of our Iustification, with the sinne which Christ was made for vs: for in the text of the Apostle there is no signification of a similitude that Christ was so made sinne, as we are made iust. That is then* M. Perkins *vaine glosse, without any likelihood in the text. The other proposition is also false, for Christ was not made sinne by imputation, for sinne in that place is taken figuratiuely, and signifieth according to the exposition of ancient Fathers,* An host or Sacrifice for sinne: *which Christ was truly made; his body being sacrificed on the Crosse for the dis-*

2. Cor. 5.

*charge of sinne, and not by imputation.*

*How these words of the Apostle,* Iustice of God, *are to bee understood, see* S. Augustine. *One place I will cite for all:* The iustice of God (*saith he*) through the faith of Christ Iesus, that is by faith wherewith we beleeue in Christ: for as that faith is called Christs, not by which Christ beleeues; so that iustice is called Gods, not whereby God is iust: both of them, faith and iustice, be ours, but therefore they are tearmed Gods, and Christs, because through their liberalitie they are giuen to vs. *Which interpretation may be confirmed out of that place of* S. Chrysostome, *which* M. Perkins *citeth saying,* It is called Gods Iustice, because it is not of workes, but of his free gift. *So that it is not that which is in God himselfe, but such as he bestoweth vpon vs; and that iustice of it selfe is pure, and wanteth no vertue to worke that for which it is giuen, to wit, to make a man righteous.* S. Anselme *a right vertuous and learned Catholike Arch-bishop of ours shall be answered when the place is quoted.*

*Tract. 26 in Joh. Item Epist. 120. ad Honorat. cap. 30. Item in Psal. 30. Conc. 1. De spirit. & lit. c. 9.*

## R. Abbot.

The words of the Apostle are plaine; yet *M. Bishop* denieth that *there is any signification of a similitude that Christ was so made sinne as wee are made iust.* *M. Perkins,* to approoue that there is a similitude, alleged the exposition of *Anselmus*: [a] *Hee was made sinne that wee might bee made Righteousnesse, not our owne but Gods, not in our selues but in him, as hee was made sinne, not his owne but ours, not in himselfe but in vs.* *M. Bishop* answereth, that *Anselme shalbe answered when the place is quoted.* He was loth of his labour to search for it, being left vnquoted by *M. Perkins,* because he saw that all his wit could not deuise what to say against it. But when he will answer, he must not answer *Anselme* only, but *Austin* also, from whom *Anselme* borrowed that exposition, as he vsed to doe very much. [b] *He then was made sinne,* saith *Austin, that wee might be made Righteousnesse, not our owne but Gods, nor in our selues but in him, euen as he by the similitude of sinfull flesh wherein hee was crucified, did shew foorth sinne, not his owne sinne but ours, not being in him, but in vs.* In which words we see it plainely affirmed, which *M. Bishop* denieth, that the Apostle in those words did intend a comparison betwixt Christs *being made sinne,* and our *being made Righteousnesse,* that as Christ not being a sinner, yet was reputed as a

[a] *Anselm. in 2. Cor. cap. 5. Ille peccatum vt nos iustitia, non nostra, sed Dei, non in nobis sed in illo; sicut ille peccatum, non suum, sed nostrum, nec in se, sed in nobis.*

[b] *August. Enchirid. cap. 41. Ipse ergò peccatum vt nos iustitia, nec nostra sua Dei simus, nec in nobis sed in ipso, sicut ipse peccatum non suum sed nostrum nec in se sed in nobis constitutum similitudine carnis peccati in qua crucifixus erat demonstrauit.*

sinner

sinner for our sakes, and for the sinne that is in vs, so we not being in our selues iust and righteous, yet are reputed iust and righteous for his sake, and for the Righteousnesse that is in him. To this purpose the exposition of *Hierome* was also brought in, and the place quoted. Hee omitted to answer to *Anselme*, because the place was not quoted: but why did he ouerpasse the other place cited directly to the point, but because he intendeth nothing but treacherie and falshood, and wilfully shutteth his eies against apparent truth? The words of *Hierome* are as cleere as the Sunne: [c] *Christ being offered for our sinnes, tooke the name of sinne, that wee might be made the Righteousnesse of God in him, not ours, nor in vs.* Where it is euident, that the Righteousnesse whereby we are iustified before God, is not any Righteousnes that is in vs, but it is the Righteousnesse of Christ imputed vnto vs, euen as our sinne was imputed vnto him. Now then it should seeme that it was not *M. Perkins* his vaine glosse to make this comparison, but it was some likelihood thereof in the text, that made all these to conceiue thereof as *M. Perkins* did. As touching the other proposition, *But Christ was made sinne by imputation of our sinnes*; hee saith that it also is false, and denieth that Christ *was made sinne by imputation*. But how then, if not by *imputation*? Forsooth by *being made a sacrifice for sinne*. But how was he made *a sacrifice for sinne*, if not by hauing *sinne imputed vnto him*? The ancient writers well obserued in the description of the sacrifices of *Moses* law, that the *sacrifice for sinne* was sometimes called by the name of *sinne*. As where *Moses* saith, [d] *He shall lay his hand vpon the head of the sinne*, that is, of the sinne offering; and *he shall slay the sinne*, that is, the sacrifice for sinne. Now because they found the name of *sinne* to bee thus giuen to the *sacrifice for sinne*, therefore where it is said of Christ that he was *made sinne for vs*, they tooke the meaning to bee this, that he was *made a sacrifice for sinne*. Which being admitted, helpeth *M. Bishop* nothing, because there is yet question to be made, why *the sacrifice for sinne* should it selfe bee called by the name of *sinne*? Surely it could bee for no other cause, but because the sinne of the man for whom it was offered, was imputed to the dumbe beast in figure of Christ, and it was to die as if it had committed the sin. Therefore the man that had sinned was appointed [e] *to lay his hand vpon the head* of his offering, as it were there to

[c] *Hieron. in 2. Cor. cap. 5. Christus pro peccatis nostris obtulit peccati nomen accepit, vt nos efficeremur iustitia Dei in ipso, non nostra, nec in nobis.*

[d] Leuit. 4. 29.

[e] Leuit. 1. 4.

lay his sinne. So saith *Theodoret*, [f] *He that brought the sacrifice layed his hands vpon the head thereof, as to lay vpon it his owne workes for which he offered the sacrifice.* Thus doth God himselfe expresse the meaning of that ceremonie: [g] *Aron shall put his hands vppon the head of the goat: and confesse ouer him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their trespasses in all their sins, putting them vpon the head of the goate: so the goat shall beare vpon him all their iniquities.* Sith Christ then was made *a sacrifice for sinne*, it followeth that the sinne of them for whom he was sacrificed, was layed vpon him, and imputed to him. Therefore *Origen* to apply that figure saith, that [h] *Christ layed the sinnes of mankind vpon his owne bodie.* And thus the Scripture teacheth vs: [i] *All we like sheepe haue gone astray, &c. and the Lord hath layed vpon him the iniquities of vs all.* [k] *He hath borne our sinnes in his body vpon the tree.* Thus *Hierome* bringeth in our Sauiour Christ, saying, [l] *Thou hast brought vppon me that wrath and storme of thy furie, which thou wast to powre foorth vpon the nations, because I haue taken vpon mee their sinnes.* How are our sinnes layed vpon Christ, how did he beare them, how hath he taken them vpon him, but by hauing the same imputed vnto him? Therefore Saint *Austin* saith: [l] *Hee made our sinnes his sinnes, that hee might make his Righteousnesse our Righteousnesse.* *God made him sinne*, that is, saith *Elias Cretensis*, [m] *He suffered him to die as a sinner because of our sinne.* But *Chrysostome* goeth yet further, not onely [n] *he made him sinne, that is, hee suffered him to bee condemned as a sinner*, but also [o] *he made the iust a sinner*, saith he, *that he might make sinners iust.* All which speeches can no otherwise be made good, but by graunting the imputation of our sinnes to be layed vpon Iesus Christ, especially the last, which seemeth verie hardely spoken, but yet the Fathers doubt not thus to speake to signifie this imputation, as shall appeare further hereafter in the eleuenth Section. Now as touching that which he citeth out of Saint *Austine*, to declare what Saint *Paul* meaneth by *the iustice or righteousnesse of God*, there is nothing in that exposition that maketh against vs. For we also say, that *the iustice of God* is meant, not that whereby God himselfe is iust, but whereby hee iustifieth vs. For Christ needed not for himselfe to be *made vnder the law*, so to performe the Righteousnesse thereof for his owne Iustification before God, being otherwise

f *Theod. in Leuit. quæst. 1. Qui victimam offerebat, imponebat super caput eius manus, tanquam suas ipsius operationes pro quibus hostiam offerebat.*

g *Leuit. 16. 21.*

h *Origen. in Leuit. lib. 1. Peccata generis humani imposuit super corpus suum.*

i *Esa. 53. 6.*

k *1. Pet. 2. 24.*

l *Hieron. in Psal. 87. Iram & procellam furoris tui quas in gentibus effudisti, super me induxisti, qui peccata eorum suscepi.*

l *August. in Psal. 22. Delicta nostra sua delicta fecit, vt iustitiam suã nostram iustitiam faceret.*

m *Elias Cretens. in Greg. Nazianzen. Orat. 5.*

n *Chrysost. in 2. Cor. hom. 11.*

o *Ibid. Iustum fecit peccatorem vt peccatores faceret iustos.*

wise simply and absolutely iust; but what hee did, hee did it for our sakes, that we therby through faith in him should be iustified in Gods sight. And this iustice or righteousnes we acknowledge to bee giuen vnto vs by Gods free liberalitie and bountie, euen as Christ himselfe is giuen vnto vs, and therefore are we said therin, [p] *to receiue the abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousnesse.* Which cannot be vnderstood of *inherent iustice*, because we doe not yet receiue the abundance of that gift, but only [q] *the first fruits*, it being such, as that *S. Austine* saith thereof, so long as wee liue here, that [r] *it rather consisteth in forgiuenes of sins, then in perfection of vertues.* Which being so, albeit his exposition contain nothing material against vs, yet we hold the same not so properly applied to the thing which he there expoundeth. For we doe not thinke that *the iustice or righteousnes of God* is so called only for that it is the gift of God, but because thereby we are iustified, thereby we are iust and righteous in the sight of God. Which because we are not by *inherent iustice*, as *S. Austine* euery where confesseth, it followeth that *the righteousnes of God* must be vnderstood of another kind of righteousnesse, which is that whereof the Apostle instructeth vs, whereby [s] *the Lord imputeth righteousnesse without works*, according to the words of *Dauid*: [t] *Blessed is the man whose vnrighteousnesse is forgiuen, and whose sinne is couered. Blessed is he to whom the Lord imputeth no sinne.* Therfore the Greeke Scholiast expounding *the righteousnes of God* to be that *that is giuen of God*, further sheweth what that gift is: [u] *The iustice or righteousnesse of God is iustification and release, or deliuerance from sinnes, from which the law could not deliuer vs.* And so *Chrysostome*, though he say as *M. Bishop* citeth, that *iustification is of grace*, that is, of Gods free gift, yet withall saith, that [x] *the righteousnes of God is so called, because it is not of workes, inasmuch as it is necessary that there be no spot found.* Where he presupposeth that there cannot be found any righteousnes of works, but such as is spotted and defiled, and therfore importeth that *the righteousnesse of God*, which must bee without spot, can by no meanes be vnderstood of the righteousnesse of works. Neither doth it helpe *M. Bishop* any whit, that *inherent righteousnes is pure of it selfe*, as it is the gift of God, because though it bee pure of it selfe, and in the worke of God, yet it is soiled in the puddles of our corruption, and receiueth a blemish by our crooked & vntoward vsing

p Rom. 5. 17.

q Cap. 8. 23.

r *Aug. de ciu. Dei. lib. 19. ca. 27. Ipsa iustitia nostra tanta est in hac vita, vt potius remissione peccatorum constet, quàm perfectione virtutum.*

s Rom. 4. 6.

t Psal. 32. 1.

u *Oecumen. in Rom. cap. 3. Iustitia Dei est iustificatio & absolutio seu liberatio à peccatis à quibus non potuit lex liberare.*

x *Chrysost. in 2. Cor. hom. 11. Dei est ista iustitia quando non ex operibus, quando necessarium est etiam nullam maculam inuenire.*

vſing of it, and is neither giuen to that end, nor is ſufficient to yeeld vs iuſtification in the ſight of God. Hitherto therefore the argument ſtandeth good: As Chriſt was made ſinne, ſo wee are made righteouſneſſe. Chriſt was made ſinne by imputation of our ſinne. We are therefore made righteous by the imputation of his righteouſneſſe.

6. W. BISHOP.

Rom 5. M. Perkins *third reaſon.* As by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one ſhal many be made righteous. Marke here a compariſon between the firſt and ſecond *Adam.* Hence I reaſon thus: As by the diſobedience of *Adam* men were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of Chriſt are they made righteous: but men are made ſinners by imputation of *Adams* ſinne vnto them, and not onely by propagation of naturall corruption: *Ergo*, by imputation of Chriſts iuſtice wee are made righteous.

Anſwer. *The compariſon I allow, becauſe it is the Apoſtles, and deny that men are made ſinners by imputation of* Adams *fault; and ſay, that euery one deſcended of* Adam *by natural propagation hath his own perſonall iniquity ſticking in them, which is commonly called Originall ſin, and an high point of Pelagianiſme is it to denie it. For albeit we did not taſte of the forbidden fruit in proper perſon, yet receiue we the nature of man, polluted with that infection really, & not by imputation. And ſo the compariſon ſerues not at all* M. Perkins *turn, but beareth very ſtrongly againſt him, it being thus framed:* As by *Adams* diſobedience many were made ſinners, euen ſo by Chriſts obedience many ſhalbe iuſtified: This is his *Maior. Now to the Minor.* But by *Adams* diſobedience they were made ſinners, by drawing from him euery one his owne proper inherent iniquity, in like maner we are iuſtified by Chriſt, not by imputation of his iuſtice, but by our inherent iuſtice, which is powred into our ſoules, when we are in Baptiſme borne anew in him. *See what penurie of poore arguments they haue, that to make ſome ſhew of ſtore, are forced to propound ſuch as make manifeſtly againſt them.*

R. ABBOT.

This argument Maſter *Biſhop* could no way auoid, but by ſhewing

ing himſelfe either impudently wilfull, or abſurdly ignorant: and ſurely if his knowledge be no better then he heere expreſſeth, he hath ill beſtowed thoſe *thrice ſeuen* yeers that he hath before ſpoken of, in the ſtudie of Diuinitie, and were beſt to ſet himſelfe to ſchoole againe. The caſe is very cleere, that if wee be *ſinners* by the imputation of *Adams* ſinne, then are we alſo *righteous* by the imputation of the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt. Therefore he denieth that *we are made ſinners by the imputation of* Adams *ſinne.* Yea, but *M. Biſhop*, you ſhould then haue told vs how it is true, that the Apoſtle ſaith, that [a] *by Adams diſobedience wee are made ſinners.* For how ſhould we be *ſinners* by his diſobedience, but for that his *diſobedience* is imputed vnto vs? *Bellarmine* ſaith, and he therein ſaith truly, that [b] *Adams ſinne is imputed to all his poſteritie, as if all had committed the ſame.* Hee allegeth to that purpoſe Saint *Bernard*, ſaying, that [c] *Adams ſinne is our ſinne, and by the iuſt, though ſecret, iudgement of God, is imputed vnto vs.* Hee ſaith againe in another place, that [d] *Adams ſinne is communicated vnto vs by imputation*; that *it is imputed to all that are borne of Adam*, and calleth it *the imputation of Adams diſobedience.* If *Adam* then by diſobedience were holden a *ſinner*, and his diſobedience is imputed vnto vs, as if we our ſelues had diſobeied, it muſt needs follow, that by the imputation of the ſame diſobedience, we alſo are *ſinners* as well as he. Therefore doth the Apoſtle ſay, that [e] *in him*, that is, in *Adam*, *all haue ſinned.* If in *Adam all haue ſinned*, then in *Adam* all are *ſinners*, in *Adam* all are guiltie of ſinne. To which purpoſe Saint *Bernard* ſaith, [f] *In Adam wee haue all ſinned, and in him wee haue all receiued the ſentence of damnation.* So Saint *Auſtine* alſo ſaith, that [g] *the debt (or treſpaſſe) of our firſt parents, did binde all their poſteritie after them. Adam* then bare the perſon of all mankinde, either ſtanding to ſtand for all, or falling to fall for all, being to beget children according to his owne image, either wherein hee ſhould continue if he did continue, or whereto hee ſhould fall if he did fall. Therefore [h] *when he ſinned, we all being in his loines*, as *Bellarmine* ſaith, *ſinned in him and by him*, and his ſin by imputation lieth vpon vs al. But ſaith *M. Biſhop, euery one deſcended of Adam by naturall propagatiō hath his own perſonall iniquity ſticking in him, which is commonly called Original ſinne.* In which words he ſomwhat toucheth the reputation of his ſcholerſhip, in that he hath not learned

a Rom. 5. 19.

b *Bellarm. de Amiſſ. grat. & ſtatu peccati. lib. 4. cap. 10. Peccatum Adami ita poſteris omnibus imputatur, acſi omnes idem peccatū patrauiſſent.*

c *Bernard Domin. prima poſt Epiphan. ſer. 1. Noſtra eſt culpa & nobis iuſto Dei iudicio imputabatur licet occulto.*

d *Bellar. ibid. lib. 5. cap. 17. Communicatur per imputationem. Omnibus enim imputatur qui ex Adamo naſcuntur.*

e Rom. 5. 12.

f *Bernard. de aduent. Dom. ſer. 1. In Adam omnes peccauimus, & in eo ſententiam damnationis accepimus omnes.*

g *Aug. de Trin. lib. 13. cap. 12. Parentum prioris debito vniuerſos poſteros obligante.*

h *Ibid. vt ſupra.*

to

to put difference betwixt *perſonall* and *Originall ſin*, which writers commonly diſtinguiſh one from another. For *perſonall ſinne* is that which groweth from the perſon whoſe ſinne it is, and is taken to be that which we call *actuall ſinne*; but *originall ſinne*, is that, which being *actuall and perſonall* to the firſt man, is deriued by propagation, and thereby becommeth naturall to all the reſt. Thus *Cyprian* mentioneth them as diuers, when ſpeaking of the Patriarches and Prophets, and other iuſt and holy men, he ſaith [i] *they neither wanted originall nor perſonall ſinne*. So *Bellarmine*, *M. Biſhops* good Maiſter, ſeuereth them, in ſaying, that [k] *Original ſinne is no leſſe truly and properly ſinne then perſonall*, and that *Adams* ſin *in him is called actuall and perſonall, but in vs originall*. It is wonder that ſo great a man as *M. Biſhop* ſhould be ignorant in this point. But now what will he make of this *originall ſinne*? Marry, ſaith he, *we receiue the nature of man polluted with that infection really, and not by imputation*. Indeed we receiue the nature of man *polluted with infection*, but doth your learning ſerue you no better, but to make *infection* the whole matter of *originall ſinne*? You ſhould know, that *originall ſinne* conteineth [l] *reatum & maculam*, firſt *a guilt* of actuall tranſgreſſion, and conſequently *a blot of infection*. For of this *infection or pollution of nature S. Auſtin* in infinite places doth rightly obſerue, that it is [m] *ſo a ſinne, as that it is alſo a puniſhment of ſinne*. Now a *puniſhment* preſuppoſeth *a guilt* of that *ſinne* whereof it is a *puniſhment*. For [n] *it is no iuſtice*, as Auſtine ſaith, *that the puniſhment ſhould paſſe without the ſinne*. Seeing therefore the puniſhment of the ſinne of *Adam* is lying vpon vs, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that there is lying vpon vs an imputation of the ſinne. And ſo the ſame *S. Auſtin* ſaith, that [o] *we are holden enwrapped in the guilt therof, and thereby are holden ſubiect to the puniſhment*. *M. Biſhop* thē we hope wil learn hēceforth to ſee that it ariſeth of *imputation*, that we receiue the nature of man polluted really with infection. But by this meanes he is now become in a pitifull caſe, hauing no way left to auoid the argument, but that it ſtandeth firme and ſure, that as from *Adam* we are firſt ſinners by imputation, and conſequently ſinfull by corruption, ſo from Chriſt we are firſt iuſtified by imputatiō, & conſequently renewed to inherent iuſtice by ſanctification. In moment of time both theſe concurre together, but in *order of nature* there is firſt righteouſnewe by imputation, and thereby is way made to inward regeneration

i *Cyprian. de ieiunio & tentat. Chriſti. Nec originali nec perſonali carnere delicto.*

k *Bellarm. vt ſupra. Originale peccatum nō minus verē & propriè peccatum eſt quàm perſonale. In Adamo actuale & perſonale, in nobis originale dicitur.*

l *Bellarm. de Amiſſ. grat. & ſtatu peccati. lib. 4. cap. 10*

m *Auguſt. Retract. li. 1. ca. 15. Peccatum tale vt idem ſit & pœna peccati.*

n *Idem cont. Iulian. lib 2. Non erat iuſtum ſine crimine tranſire ſupplicium.*

o *Idem. Retract. li. 1. cap. 15. Dicimus nos reatu eius implicatos & ob hoc pœnæ obnoxios detineri:*

ration. At this argument they are all faine to hoodwinke themſelues, becauſe they cannot truly deſcribe the ſtate of originall ſinne according to their owne grounds, but they giue it way inuitably to proceede againſt them. They will haue it, as *M. Biſhop* here telleth vs out of [p] *Bellarmine*, that the Apoſtles meaning is, that we are *made ſinners by inherent corruption*. But we tell them, and they can by no meanes auoid it, that the condition of being *ſinners by inherent corruption*, becauſe it is a puniſhment of ſinne, muſt preſuppoſe vs to be formerly *ſinners* otherwiſe, and that is onely by imputation. As therefore we are firſt ſinners by imputatiõ from *Adam*, ſo are we firſt iuſtified by imputation from Chriſt, regeneration to inherent righteouſneſſe following of the imputation of the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, euen as inherent corruption followeth of the imputation of *Adams* ſinne, as before was ſaid. And hereof *S. Bernard* ſpeaketh moſt notably: [q] *Why ſhould not righteouſneſſe be of another, ſeeing guilt is of another? It is another that maketh me a ſinner, it is another that iuſtifieth from ſinne: the one in his ſeede, the other in his blood. Is there ſinne in the ſeede of a ſinner, and is there not righteouſneſſe in the blood of Chriſt? But thou wilt ſay, If there be a righteouſneſſe of any ones, what is that to thee? Be it ſo: but then let the fault alſo be whoſe it is, what is that to me? ſhall the righteouſneſſe of the righteous be vpon himſelfe, and ſhall not the wickedneſſe of the wicked be vpon himſelfe? It is not meete that the ſonne ſhould beare the iniquity of the Father, and be denied to be partaker of the righteouſneſſe of his brother.* In which words we ſee that moſt clearly he affirmeth, both the imputation of *Adams* ſinne to condemnation, and the imputation of the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt accordingly to iuſtification. I will conclude this point with the words of *Chryſoſtome*: [r] *If a Iew ſhall ſay vnto thee* (put caſe he had ſaid, If a Papiſt ſhall ſay vnto thee) *How is all the world ſaued it beeing onely Chriſt that hath done righteouſly, thou maiſt anſwer him, How was the whole world condemned, when it was onely* Adam *that obeied not?* The matter of our condemnation then is in the one, & the matter of our ſaluation in the other, corruption of nature being conſequently drawne by generation from the one, as a part of our condemnation; and ſanctification to holineſſe conſequently deriued by faith and regeneration from the other, as a part of our ſaluation. And now he may well ſee that our arguments be not *poore*,

p *Bellarm. de grat & lib. arbit. l. 1. c. 4.*

q *Bernard. epiſt. 190. Cur no aliùdè iuſtitia ciuis aliunde reatus? Alius qui peccatorem conſtituit, alius qui iuſtificat a peccato: alter in ſemine, alter in ſanguine. An peccatum ſa ſemine peccatoris & non iuſtitia in Chriſti ſanguine? ſed iuſtitia, inquiet, ſi cuius eſt quid ad te? Eſto, ſed ſit etiam culpa cuius eſt; quid ad me? An iuſtitia iuſti ſuper eum erit, & impietas impij nõ erit ſuper eum? Non conuenit filium portare iniquitatem patris & fraterne fieri exortem iuſtitiæ.*

r *Chryſoſt. in Rom. hom. 10 Si tibi Iudeus dixerit, Quo pacto vno recte agente Chriſto vniuerſus orbis ſalutis factus eſt, poſſit illi reſpondere, Quo pacto vno non obediente Adam vniuerſus orbis condemnatus eſt?*

*nor make against our selues*, as he pretendeth, but his answers are such penurious and poor shifts, as that now they are once discouered, we expect from him no further maintaining of them.

## 7. W. Bishop.

*His fourth reason.* The Papists make Christs obedience their satisfaction, but satisfaction is equall to iustice, therfore they must make it as well their iustice as satisfaction. *For the* Maior *he citeth* Bellarmine. *I haue read the Chapter, and find no such words, further I say, there is a great difference betweene satisfaction from mortall sinnes, and iustification: for satisfaction cannot be done by vs; for the guilt of mortall sinne is infinite, being against an infinit Maiestie, and so no creature can make full satisfaction for it: wherefore the infinite valour of Christs satisfaction is necessarily required, who hauing taken away the guilt of eternall punishment, due to sinnes, leaueth vs his grace to satisfie for the temporall paine of it, as shall be in his due place declared more at large.*

*Lib. 2. de. Justif. cap. 7.*

*Againe, a man must needes haue his sinnes pardoned, and grace giuen him, before he can make any kinde of due satisfaction, for he must be in the state of grace before he can satisfie, wherefore he must needs flie to the benefit of Christs satisfaction: There is nothing like in iustification; for first to make a man iust in Gods sight, requires no infinit perfection, but such as a meer mã is very wel capable of, as al must needs confesse of* Adam *in the state of innocencie, and of all the blessed Soules in heauen who be iust in Gods sight. Neither is it necessarie to be infinit, for to be worthy of the ioyes of heauen, which be not infinite as they are enioyed of men or Angels, either of whom haue al things there in number, weight, and measure. Briefly, it is a most easie thing for one man to pay the debts of another, but one man cannot bestowe his wisdome or iustice on another, and not credible, that God (whose iudgement is according to truth) will repute a man for iust, who is full of iniquitie: no more then a simple man will take a Black moore for white, although he see him cloathed in a white sute of apparell.*

## 1. W. Bishop.

In true and right vnderstanding, *satisfaction* is fully equiualent to *iustification*, and that that is our *satisfaction*, is also our *iustification* before

before God. For declaration whereof, it is to bee obſerued, that *ſinne* conſiſteth partly in commiſſion, partly in omiſſion: partly in doing that that we ought not to doe, partly in not doing that that we ought to doe. Satisfaction then for ſinne muſt ſerue to acquit both the one & the other: it muſt take away what we haue done, and ſupply what we haue not done, or elſe it cannot bee called *a ſatisfaction*. Therefore as on the one ſide in the euill that we haue done, we are reputed as if it neuer had beene done; ſo on the other ſide, in the good that we haue not done, we are reputed as if al had been done. Accordingly *S. Auſtine* ſaith, that [a] *all the Commandements of God are reputed to be done, when that is pardoned that is not done*. Our ſatisfaction therefore is our iuſtification with God, becauſe thereby we are reputed as if we had performed all the righteouſneſſe of God. And ſo doth *Bernard* make them both one, when ſaying, [b] *There is the right eouſneſſe of another aſſigned to him who wanted of his owne*, he addeth to expreſſe the ſame, [c] *the ſatisfaction of one is imputed vnto all, euen as hee alone hath borne the ſins of all*. But more clearely is it euicted by the words of the Apoſtle, who, where *Dauid* pronounceth the man [d] *bleſſed, to whom the Lord forgiueth his ſinnes*, ſaith, that he [e] *deſcribeth* there *the bleſſedneſſe of that man to whom the Lord imputeth righteouſnes without works*; giuing thereby to vnderſtand, that *forgiueneſſe of ſinnes is the imputation of righteouſnes without works*. If therefore in *ſatisfaction* there bee forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, then is there alſo *iuſtification*, that is, the imputation of righteouſneſſe without workes. Now then ſith *Bellarmine* confeſſeth, that the merit and obedience of Chriſt is our ſatisfaction, he muſt acknowledge it alſo to be our iuſtification, that is, the thing whereby, and for which we are reputed iuſt in the ſight of God, becauſe thereby we are reputed, as hauing perfectly fulfilled al the commandements of God. *I haue read the chapter in Bellarmine*, ſaith *M. Biſhop, and find no ſuch words*. But he was drowſie belike when he read it; let him read it better when he is well awake, and then he ſhall finde that *Bellarmine* ſaith, that *in true meaning it may be ſaid, that the merits of Chriſt are imputed vnto vs, for that they are giuen vnto vs of God, and wee may offer the ſame to God the Father for our ſinnes, in reſpect that Chriſt hat taken vpon him the burden of ſatisfying for our ſinnes*. Where what doth hee but acknowledge that Chriſt according to the burden taken vpon

a *Aug. Retract. lib. 1. ca. 19. Omnia mandata ſancta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit ignoſcitur.*

b *Bernard. epiſt. 190. Aſſignata eſt ei aliena iuſtitia qui caruit ſua.*

c *Satisfactio vnius omnibus imputatur, &c.*

d Pſal. 32. 1.

e Rom. 4. 6.

f *Bellarm. de Iuſtif. lib. 2. cap. 7. Si ſolùm vellent nobis imputari Chriſti merita, quia nobis donata ſunt, & poſſumus ea Deo patri offerre pro peccatis noſtris, quoniam Chriſtus ſuſcepit ſuper ſe onus ſufaciendi pro peccatis noſtris, noſque Deo patri reconciliandi, recta eſſet eorum ſententia.*

vpon him, hath in his merits made satisfaction for our sinnes: but in his folly like *M. Bishop*, because he vnderstandeth not himselfe, will not haue them imputed for our righteousnesse before God. His differences betwixt saluation & iustification are impertinent, because that iustification which he speaketh of, is not our iustification before God, as shal appeare. Briefly therfore to touch what he saith, *the guilt*, saith he, *of mortall sinne is infinite, being against an infinite maiestie*. But therefore the guilt of all sinne is infinite, neither is there any sinne but what is mortall, because all sinne is against an infinite maiestie. Therfore to all sinne *the infinite valour of Christs satisfaction is required*, which because it is infinite, is absurdly by M. *Bishop* restrained to the taking away only of the *guilt of eternall punishment*; for that that is *infinite* admitteth no restraint. Wherefore that which he addeth of our satisfaction for temporal paines, is a meere fable; neither without nor in the state of grace can we make satisfaction to God for any sinne. Iustification hee saith *requires no infinite perfection*, and it is true indeed as he meaneth it, but the true iustification requireth an infinite perfection and worth, to purchase vnto sinners forgiuenesse of sins, attonement with God, regeneration of grace, and euerlasting life, which none could doe but onely the sonne of God. And whereas hee saith, that *there is not any infinite perfection necessary to be worthie of the ioies of heauen*, he wonderfully deceiueth himselfe vpon a false ground. There is no infinite perfection necessarie to come to the enioying or possessing of the ioies of heauen, but there is an infinite perfection necessarily required to be *worthy* thereof, because that that is finite can haue no proportion and worth to that that is infinite, and therfore the finite perfection of man cannot be worthie of the infinite ioies of heauen. But saith *M. Bishop*, *the ioies of heauen are not infinite, as they are enioied of men or of Angels, either of whom haue all things there in number, weight, and measure*. Wherein hee againe mistaketh much, because the ioies of heauen as touching time and continuance, are infinite, and come within no bounds or compasse of number or measure, in which sort the damned beare the infinite wrath of God, according to the guilt of sin, being not thereof capable in any other sort. Which being so, it would be knowne of *M. Bishop* or some of his, how it should come to passe, that the perfections of men in the state of grace, should

should be of sufficient worth to purchase the infinite ioyes of heauen, and the satisfactions of men in the state of grace, should not be of the like sufficient worth to purchase deliuerance from the infinite paines of hell. But in this we shall hereafter haue occasion further to appose him. Here he goeth on and telleth vs, that *it is a most easie thing for one man to pay the debt of another*, and we willingly admit it to be true. But then what wee were in debt vnto God for want of wisdome and iustice, what hindereth but that Christ our surety might pay the same? If he pay for vs what we want for our selues, then his paiment acquitteth vs of all imputation of our want. And surely though a man bestow not his wisdome or iustice vpon another, yet nothing is thereto let, but that what one man by wisdome or iustice doth for another, the same should stand good for him for whō it is done. But we would gladly know of *M. Bishop*, if his holy harlot mother haue instructed him so far, how it should stand with reason, that they by the Popes indulgences, should be made partakers of the merits and good works one of another, and that it should be against reason, that we by the ordinance of God should be partakers of the merits & righteousnesse of Iesus Christ. The Abbats of the Cistercian Friers being gratified in a request by the King of France, are said by *Matthew Paris.* [g] *to haue granted vnto him the speciall participation of their good works.* The Friars here in England made men beleeue, that they [h] *gaue them participation of all the masses, praiers, fastings, watchings, preachings, abstinences, indulgences, labours, and all good works that were done by the brethren of their order here in England.* With what face doe these wretches deny, that to the righteousnesse and merit of the Sonne of God, which thus blasphemously and lewdly they attribute to the blinde deuotions, and imagined righteousnesse of sinfull and wicked men? Yea, but saith *M. Bishop, it is not credible that God whose iudgement is according to truth, will repute a man for iust who is full of iniquity, no more then a simple mā wil take a Black-moore for white, although he see him in a white suit of apparell.* And indeed it is not credible, that God wil repute him to be inherently iust, whō he hath taught to acknowledge himselfe a sinner, but credibly it is & true, that God doth accept as iust for Christs sake, & by forgiuenes of sins impute righteousnes vnto him, whō he seeth in himself to be vnrighteous. [i] *All that are iustified by Christ*, saith *Austin, are iust, not in the selues, but in him.*

[g] *Matth. Paris. in Henrico 3. anno 1244. Speciale suorum bonorum operum ei participium concesserunt.*

[h] Out of the copie of a pardon granted by the Carmelite Friars in London. *anno* 1527.

[i] *August. in Ioan. tract. 3. Omnes qui per Christum iustificati, iusti, non in se sed in illo Si in se interroges, Adam sunt: in illo si interroges, Christi sunt.*

*If a man aske of them in themselues, they are Adam: if in him, they are Christs.* It should not then seeme so strange to *M. Bishop*, that men, though being vniust in themselues, yet by faith should be reputed iust & righteous in Christ. And surely *S. Bernard* plainly saith, k*Thy righteousnes couereth in me a multitude of sins, but in thee ô Lord, what but the treasures of pietie, the riches of goodnesse?* Thus he is content to acknowledge himselfe *a blacke-moore*, blacke in himselfe, but clothed with the white sute of Iesus Christ. So doth the Church the spouse of Christ say of her selfe, l*I am blacke, O daughters of Ierusalem, but comely*, that is, saith *Theodoret*, m*I am a Blacke-moore*, not only for that she hath been, but also for that she still in part is: n*blacke* (saith *Ambrose*)) *by frailtie of humane condition, comely by grace, blacke because she is of sinners, comely by the sacrament of faith:* o*blacke* (saith *Iustus*) *by confession of sinnes, comely by the grace of the sacrament.* This is the beauty of the Church for the time, not her being without sinne, but remission and forgiuenesse of sinnes, testified by the sacraments of Christ, being pledges of the redemption that she hath obtained in him. And hereof *Bernard* well saith, that p*in the place of her pilgrimage, with the comelineesse of her feature, she wanteth not her mole or spot of blacknesse. It shall bee otherwise in her country* (saith hee) *when the bridegroome of glory shall make her to himselfe a glorious Church, not hauing spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. But now if shee should say she hath no blacknesse, she should deceiue her selfe, and there were no truth in her.* And yet we see, that euen now the bridegroome speaking to her, saith, q*O thou faire among women*: r*Behold thou art faire my loue, behold thou art faire.* She is s*faire* by *his beauty which he hath set vpon her*, but remaineth yet still a *Blacke-moore*, by that that she hath remaining of her selfe. Therefore he saith, *O thou faire*, but yet addeth, *amongst women.* *S. Bernard* telleth the meaning, t*I call thee faire, but amongst women*, that is, *in part or partly faire*, thereby giuing againe to vnderstand, that partly she continueth *a Blacke-moore* still. And what? doth *M. Bishop* thinke it amisse to confesse so much of himselfe? doth he take it in skorn to be likened to a Blacke-moore? Let him be well assured, that if he thinke scorne to confesse himself a *Blacke-moore*, he shall neuer be any of them that shall be clothed in white. Nay, because being *a Blacke-moore*, and very blacke, he setteth nought by the white garment of Iesus Christ, let him know that

k *Bernard. in Cant. ser. 61. Et in me quidem operit (iustitia tua) multitudinem peccatorum, in te autem quid nisi pietatis thesauros, diuitias bonitatis?*

l Cant. 1. 4.

m *Theod. in Cant. Ego sum Aethiopissa.*

n *Ambr. of. de iis qui init. myster. cap. 7. Nigra per fragilitatem conditionis humanæ, decora per gratiam: nigra quia ex peccatoribus, decora fidei sacramento.*

o *Iustus in Cant. num. 8. Nigra confessione peccatorum: formosa gratia sacramenti.*

p *Bernar. in Cant. ser. 25. Potest sponsa cum pulchritudine vtique compositionis nauo non carere nigredinis, sed fortasse in loco peregrinationis suæ. Alioquin erit cùm eam sibi in patria exhibebit sponsus gloriæ gloriosam, non habentem maculam aut rugam, aut aliquid huiusmodi. At verò mirum si diceres quia nigredinem non haberet, fuisse fœdè seduceret, &c.*

q Cant. 1. 7.

r Cap. 4. 1.

s Ezech. 16. 14.

t *Bernar. in Cant. ser. 38. Ego te dico pulchram, sed inter mulieres, id est, ex parte.*

that his ſhame and nakedneſſe lieth open, and his filthineſſe continueth lothſome & hateful in the ſight of God. As for his exaggeration, I emit it, becauſe it is but the running ouer of his vncleane mouth, which ceaſeth not to cry, *full of iniquitie, full of iniquitie*, of him whom Chriſt hath begun to purge from iniquitie, and framed in conuerſation to depart from iniquity, as we profeſſe of euery one that is iuſtified by faith in him.

## 1. W. Bishop.

M. Perkins *laſt reaſon is taken from the conſent of the antient Church, and yet cyteth, (ſauing one two lines) nothing out of any antient writer, nor out of any other, but out of only* S. Bernard, *who liued* 1000. *yeeres after Chriſt. ſo that he ſignifieth that there is little reliefe to be had in antiquity. Which* Caluin *declareth more plainly, for he commonly ſetting light by all other in this queſtion, reiecteth alſo* S. Auguſtine, *ſaying:* Yea not the ſentence of *Auguſtine* himſelfe is to be receiued in this matter, who attributeth our ſanctification to grace, wherewith we are regenerate in newneſſe of life by the ſpirit. *And* Kemnitius, *in the firſt part of his examination of the Councel of Trent ſaith*, We contend not how the Fathers take iuſtification. *And a little after*: I am not ignorant that they ſpake otherwiſe then we doe of it. *Therefore* M. Perkins *had reaſon to content himſelfe with ſome few broken ſentences of latter writers. But was* S. Bernard (*trow you*) *in this one point a Proteſtant? Nothing leſſe. His words be theſe*: The iuſtice of another is aſſigned vnto man, who wanted his owne: man was indebted, and man made paiment, &c. *But better let his own reaſon there cited, ſerue for expoſition of his former words: which is this*: For why may not iuſtice be from another, as well as guiltineſſe is from another? *Now guiltineſſe from* Adam, *is not by imputation, but euery one contracts his owne, by taking fleſh from him; euen ſo iuſtice is from Chriſt powred into euery man that is borne againe of water and the holy Ghoſt. In the ſecond place he ſaith*, That mans iuſtice is the mercifulneſſe of God: *that is*, by Gods free grace and mercy it is beſtowed vpon vs. *With* S. Bernard *in the third place we acknowledge, that we haue no iuſtice of our own, that is from our ſelues, but from the goodnes of God, through the merits of our bleſſed Sauiours paſſion: reade his firſt ſermon vpon theſe words of the Prophet* Iſay: Vidi Dominũ, &c.

*Lib. 3. Inſtit. cap. 11. num. 15.*

*Epiſt. 105.*

*Ser. 1. Super Iſaiam.*

*There you ſhall ſee him ſpeake plainly of inherent iuſtice, and how it is a diſtinct thing from the iuſtice of Chriſt. Another broken peece of a ſentence, there is cited out of* S. Auguſtine: Chriſt made his iuſtice our iuſtice. *That is, by his iuſtice he hath merited iuſtice for vs, as he expoundeth himſelfe.* What is this, the iuſtice of God, and the iuſtice of man? *The iuſtice of God is here called that, not whereby God is iuſt, but that which God giueth to man, that man may be iuſt through God.*

In Pſal 22.

Tract. 27. in Ioan.

R. ABBOT.

*S. Bernard* may be ſufficient to teſtifie vnto vs, the doctrine and conſent of the antient Church, vnleſſe *M. Biſhop* can charge him to haue departed therefrom; which becauſe he dares not doe, leſt haply he ſhould make an heretike of him, whom his holy Father hath made a Saint, hee muſt needs yeeld, that antiquity hath acknowledged the imputation of the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, becauſe *S. Bernard* hauing ſo learned of antiquity, hath giuen expreſſe teſtimony and witneſſe of it. Yea, but Maſter *Biſhop* telleth vs, that *Caluin plainly declareth, that for this there is little reliefe to be had in antiquity, who commonly ſetting light by all the reſt, in this queſtion reiecteth alſo Saint Auſtine.* Now hee citeth certaine words of *Caluin* very lewdly falſified, and wreſted from the purpoſe to which they were ſpoken. The thing that *Caluin* there ſpeaketh of, is the ſignification of the name of *grace*. Hee taxeth the Maſter of the ſentences for his miſconſtruction of it, who, he ſaith, though taking vpon him to follow *Auſtine*, yet varied from him, both obſcuring and corrupting him. But the ſchoolemen that came after, he condemneth much more, for that they neuer gaue ouer, till they were growne in a maner to Pelagianiſme. Hereupon he addeth, [a] *And indeed the ſentence of* Auſtine, *or at leaſtwiſe his manner of ſpeaking, is not in all reſpects to be receiued. For although he doe notably bereaue man of all commendation of righteouſnes, and doe aſcribe it wholly to the grace of God, yet he referreth grace to ſanctification, whereby through the ſpirit we are borne againe to newneſſe of life.* Compare theſe words gentle Reader with thoſe that *M. Biſhop* hath cited, & conſider whether thou maieſt dare hereafter to truſt him vpó his word. *Caluin* noteth *Auſtine*, only for ſome vnproper vnderſtanding, or vſing of the name of *grace*, as meaning thereby *the grace of* ſancti-

[a] *Calu. Inſtit. lib. 3. cap. 11. ſect. 15. At ne Auguſtini quidem ſententia vel ſalem loquendi ratio per omnia recipienda eſt. Tametſi enim egregiè hominē omni iuſtitiæ laude ſpoliet ac totam Dei gratiæ tranſcribat, gratiam tamen ad ſanctificationem refert, qua in vitæ nouitatem per ſpiritum regeneramur.*

*ſanctification*, wheras the ſcripture by *grace* meaneth the free mercy of God, accepting vs freely in Chriſt by the forgiuenes of our ſins, and this *M. Biſhop* citeth, as if *Caluin* had affirmed, that *Auſtines* opiniō had ben wholy againſt him, as touching iuſtification by the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt. In like ſort he abuſeth *Chemnicius*, whoſe words in the former place are theſe, [b] *We contend not againſt the Fathers, albeit they commonly take the word (iuſtifying) for that renewing whereby the works of righteouſneſſe are wrought in vs, whereas according to the Scripture, they rightly and conueniently deliuer the doctrine, how and for what a man is reconciled vnto God, receiueth remiſſion of ſins, and adoption, and is accepted vnto euerlaſting life.* In the other place he ſaith, [c] *I am not ignorant that the Fathers do often vſe the word (iuſtifie) in this ſignification,* (namely to make inherently iuſt) *but the queſtion is of the propriety of tongues.* He confeſſeth that the Fathers ſometimes do ſomwhat differ from vs, as touching the ſignification of the word, but rightly & truly affirmeth, that as touching the matter & point of doctrine they teach the ſame that wee do. Surely if betwixt the Papiſts and vs there were no greater difference, then onely about the meaning of a word, we would not looſe our time nor ſpend our labour friuolouſly and idlely to contend againſt them. But they abuſe the Fathers miſtaking of a word to the ouerthrowing of the doctrine approoued by the Fathers. And yet the Fathers when they place *iuſtification in the forgiueneſſe of ſinnes*, as many times they doe, and teach that by the righteouſnes that is in vs being defectiue and vnperfect, [d] *no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified in the ſight of God*, as they alledge out of the Pſalme, they doe neither in matter of doctrine, nor meaning of the word depart from that that is maintained by vs. *S. Auſtine* ſaith; *Iuſt it is that the debters (or treſpaſſers) whom the diuell held, ſhould be let goe free, beleeuing in him whom hee ſlew without debt (or treſpaſſe.) This is it that we are ſaid to be iuſtified in the bloud of Chriſt.* [f] *Wee are iuſtified in his bloud, in that we are freed from all ſinnes; and freed from all ſins, for that the Son of God who had no ſin was ſlaine for vs.* So *Theodoret* giuing the mening of the words of the Apoſtle, *we are iuſtified freely, &c.* maketh it to be this, [g] *Bringing faith onely, we obtaine the forgiuenes of our ſins. Origen* maketh theſe words, *Thy ſins are forgiuen*

b *Chemn. Exam. Concil. Triden. de iuſtific. Patribus licet verbum (iuſtificare) accipiamo pro renouatione qua efficiuntur in nobis per ſpiritum opera iuſtitiæ, non monemus iſtem, vbi iuxta ſcripturā rectè & commodè traduns doctrinā quomodo et quare perſona Deo reconcilietur &c.*

c *Patres quidem verbū iuſtificare in hac ſignificatione ſæpe vſurpare non ignoro, ſed de proprietate linguarū quæſtio eſt.*

d *Pſal. 143. 2.*

e *Aug. de Trin. lib. 13. cap. 14. Vtique iuſtū eſt vt debitores quos tenebat liberi dimittātur, credentes in eum quem ſine vllo debito occidit: hoc eſt quòd iuſtificari dicimur in ſanguine Chriſti.*

f *Ibid. cap. 16. Iuſtificati planè in eo quòd à peccatis omnibus liberati: liberati autem à peccatis omnibus Sola fide allata remiſſionem peccatorum conſequimur.*

g *Theodoret. in Rom. cap. 3. quoniam pro nobis eſt Dei filius qui nullum habebat occiſus.*

thee,[h] the pronouncing of the iuſtificatiō of the woman, who with her teares waſhed the feet of Chriſt. *S. Bernard* ſaith, that i *our being iuſtified freely by faith*, which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, conſiſteth in *beleeuing that our ſinnes are forgiuen vs.* But moſt fitly to the purpoſe he ſaith in another place, [k] *Where there is reconciliation, there is forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, and what is that but iuſtification?* Now according to this conſtruction of iuſtification, they are wont to deliuer, that [l] *mans iuſtice or righteouſneſſe, is to hope or put truſt in him in whom is forgiueneſſe of ſinnes*; that *our righteouſneſſe in this life is rather forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, then perfection of vertues*; that [m] *the onely hope of all the godly groning vnder this burdē of corruptible fleſh in the infirmity of this life, is this, that we haue an aduocate with the Father Ieſus Chriſt the iuſt, and he is the propitiation for our ſinnes*, as *S. Auſtine* ſpeaketh: that [n] *then we are iuſt when wee confeſſe our ſelues ſinners, and our righteouſneſſe conſiſteth not of our merit, but of the mercie of God*, as *Hierome* ſaith: that [o] *we are not to reioyce that wee are iuſt, but that we are redeemed; not that we are without ſinne, but that our ſinnes are forgiuen vs; not in the good that we haue done, or that any other man hath done for vs, but that Chriſt is our aduocate with the Father; that the blood of Chriſt was ſhed for vs*, as *Ambroſe* ſaith; that [p] *Chriſt is our righteouſneſſe in the forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes*, and that [q] *Gods forgiueneſſe (or pardon) is mans righteouſneſſe*, as *S. Bernard* ſaith. Now what do we teach otherwiſe then all theſe haue taught, when we ſay, that we are reputed iuſt by the forgiuenes of our ſinnes, and that this is our iuſtification in the ſight of God? For what are we but *iuſt* in the ſight of God, when there is taken from vs the imputation of all ſinne? Surely [r] *to be iuſt* is the ſame as *not to bee a ſinner*; and [s] *in the way of faith they to whom their ſinnes are not imputed, are accounted not ſinners.* Therefore it followeth that they are accounted *iuſt*. Yea as was before alledged, [t] *all the commandements of God are reputed to be done, when that which is not done is pardoned.* But hee who is reputed to haue done all the *commandements* of God, is reputed iuſt. He therefore to whom God pardo-

h *Origen. ad Rom. cap. 3.*

i *Bernard in Annunciat. ſer. 1. Crede quia per ipſum tibi peccata donantur. Sic enim arbitratur Apoſtolus gratis iuſtificari hominē per fidem.*

k *Idem epiſt. 190 Vbi reconciliatio, ibi remiſſio peccatorum, & quid ipſa niſi iuſtificatio?*

l *Auguſt. in Pſa. 32. Hic eſt modus humanæ iuſtitiæ, vt vita mortalis quantumlibet profeciat, quia ſine delicto eſſe non poteſt in hoc non delinquat, dum ſperat in eum in quo eſt remiſſio delictorum.*

*Idē de ciu. Dei lib. 19. cap. 27. vt ſupra ſect. 5.*

m *Idem com. 2 epiſt. Pelag. lib. 3. cap. 5 Omnium ꝓorum, &c. Spes vnica eſt quòd aduocatum habemus &c.*

n *Hieron. adu. Pelag. lib. 1. Tunc iuſti ſumus quando nos peccatores fatemur & iuſtitiā noſtra non ex ꝓprio merito ſed ex Dei conſiſtere miſericordia.*

o *Ambroſ. de Jacob. &c. Non gloriabor quia iuſtus ſum, ſed gloriabor quia redemptus ſum. Gloriabor non quia vacuus peccati ſum, ſed quia mihi remiſſa ſunt peccata. Non gloriabor quia profuſus ad., quia profuit mihi quiſquam, ſed quia pro me aduocatus apud patrem Chriſtus eſt. ſed quia pro me Chriſti ſanguis effuſus eſt.* p *Bernard. in Cant. ſer 22. Iuſtitia in abſolutione peccatorum.* q *Ibid. ſer 23. Hominis iuſtitia indulgentia Dei.* r *Auguſt. de verb. Apoſt. ſer. 16. Puto hoc eſſe dicere, Iuſtus ſum, quod eſt, Peccator non ſum.* s *Idem in Pſal. 118. conc. 3. In via fidei pro non peccatoribus habentur quibus peccata non imputantur.* t *Idem Retract. lib. 1. cap. 19. vt ſupra ſect. 7.*

neth

neth, that which he hath not done is reputed iuſt. [u] *In the way of faith if any thing be committed by ſtepping out of the way, for the waies ſake it is not imputed, and a man is taken as if he had not done it.* Yea, [x] *all that God hath determined not to impute, is all one as if it had neuer bin.* Now he that is taken as if he had neuer done amiſſe, is reputed iuſt. Whoſoeuer therfore is in the way of faith, is reputed iuſt. And thus much is included in the ſayings of the Fathers, whereſoeuer they teach forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, who therby to expreſſe our iuſtification learned of the Apoſtle himſelfe, who ſaith, that we are *iuſtified y through the redemption that is in Chriſt*, and expoundeth that *redemption* by [z] *forgiueneſſe of ſinnes*, and in the *not imputing of ſinne*, vnderſtandeth [a] *the imputing of righteouſnes without works*, as before was ſaid. Now forgiueneſſe of ſinnes is yeelded vnto vs by vertue of the merit & righteouſnes which Chriſt hath wrought for vs, who [b] *was giuen for vs*, and [c] *gaue himſelfe for vs*; who was [d] *made vnder the law to redeeme vs*, and therefore is [e] *iuſt or righteous for vs*; who [f] *ſhed his bloud for vs*, [g] *died for vs*, [h] *roſe againe for vs*, and whatſoeuer he hath done, hath done *for vs*. And if *for vs* the Son of God haue [i] *fulfilled all righteouſnes* and obedience to his Father, who had no need to vndergo any ſuch ſeruice for himſelfe, ſhould it not be ſtrange that the ſame ſhould not bee reckoned and imputed vnto vs? Very iuſtly it is accounted ours, whatſoeuer he hath done for vs, no leſſe then if we our ſelues had performed the ſame for our ſelues. And this is the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſſe which wee maintaine, by which our ſinnes are couered and hidden, that is, pardoned & forgiuen, and we are conſequently reputed iuſt, euen by the iuſtice or righteouſnes of Chriſt, becauſe in the righteouſnes of Chriſt is the forgiueneſſe of our ſins. But why do they reiect *imputation of righteouſnes*, which, as we haue ſeene before, the ſpirit of God ſo expreſly recommendeth vnto vs, and by the very phraſe importeth that wee are not righteous in our ſelues? Surely it were [k] *no matter of grace (or fauor)* as *Origen* well noteth, *that to a iuſt or righteous man his righteouſnes ſhould be reputed for righteouſneſſe*. But it is a matter of fauour and grace that God reputeth vs iuſt. It muſt therefore of neceſſity be by other meanes then by the righteouſnes that is in vs, which can be no other but the imputation of the righteouſnes of Chriſt, that it may be verified of him which is written, [l] *This is the name wherby*

u *Idem in Pſal.* 118 con. 3. *Siquid à demante committitur propter viam non imputatur, & tanquam non ſuerit operatus accipitur.*
x *Bern. in Cant.* 23. *Omne quod mihi ipſe non imputare decreuerit ſic eſt quaſi non fuerit.*
y Rom. 3. 24.
z Epheſ. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14.
a Rom. 4 6. 7. 8.
b Rom. 8. 32.
c Tit. 2. 14.
d Gal. 4. 5.
e *Bern in Cant. ſer.* 70. *Iuſtus pro hominibus.*
f Luk. 22. 20.
g 1. Theſſ. 5. 10.
h Act. 3. 26.
i Matt. 3. 15.
k *Origen in Rom. cap. 4. Quid videbitur gratiæ iuſto reputari iuſtitiam ad iuſtitiam?*
l Ierem. 23. 6.

*they ſhall call him, The Lord our righteouſneſſe.* Thus ſaith *Ambroſe*, [m] *Chriſt is righteouſneſſe, and of that that is his, he hath giuen vnto vs to haue fellowſhip with him:* [n] *hee hath indeed clothed vs with the couer of his fleece, & bringeth vs into the houſe of euerlaſting ſaluation.* And hereof he intimateth a compariſon, which [o] *Pighius* himſelfe could not but approue, that as *Iacob* receiued the bleſſing and inheritance in the garments and apparell of *Eſau* his elder brother, to whom the ſame did properly belong, ſo we receiue the bleſſing of God, and are accepted to eternall life in the garment of the righteouſnes of Chriſt by faith in him, whileſt thereby we obtaine the forgiuenes of our ſinnes. [p] *Iſaac ſmelled the ſauour of Iacobs garments*, (namely which *Rebecca* his mother had put vpon him of his brother *Eſaus.*) *Haply*, ſaith he, *it importeth this, that wee are not iuſtified by works, but by faith, becauſe the infirmity of fleſh is a hindrance to works, but the brightneſſe of faith ouerſhadoweth the errour of our workes, as which obtaineth the forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes.* This *ouerſhadowing* is our ſafety; this hiding & couering of our errors and imperfections, which diſgrace and blemiſh all our righteouſneſſe and workes, and what haue wee to couer and hide the ſame, but onely *the fleece* of the merit of Ieſus Chriſt? And this point Saint *Bernard*, as he was moſt abundant in ſpirituall meditation, ſo hath moſt cleerely and diuinely ſet forth vnto vs, and ſaue that we know with whom we haue to deale, we ſhould hold it almoſt incredible, that there ſhould be that impudencie in any man, as with ſo wretched and beggerly anſwers, to goe about to ſhift off ſo plaine and manifeſt proofes. [q] *There is the righteouſneſſe of another*, ſaith Saint *Bernard*, *aſſigned vnto him that wanted of his owne.* The righteouſneſſe then that is aſſigned vnto vs, is anothers, and not our owne. Yea, but *let his owne reaſon*, ſaith Maſter Biſhop, *ſerue for expoſition of his former words.* Be it ſo, and what is that reaſon? Forſooth this, ſaith hee, *For why may not iuſtice bee from another, as well as guiltineſſe is from another?* Indeed Saint *Bernard* vſeth theſe words; but how are they fitted to Maſter *Biſhops* turne, when as it is expreſſly ſaid, [r] *aliunde iuſtitia, aliunde reatus, righteouſneſſe is elſewhence or of another; guilt is elſewhence or of another?* For if it be of anothers iuſtice that a man is iuſt, and of anothers guilt that he is guilty, then is there imputed righteouſnes and imputed guilt. Nay, ſaith he, *guiltineſſe is not from Adam by imputa-*

m *Ambroſ. in Pſ. 118. ſer 18. Ipſe iuſtitia eſt & nobis de ſuo dedit ſui habere conſortium.*

n *Idem de Abrah. l. 2. cap. 8. verè nos tegmine velleris ſui veſtiuit & in domum introduxit æternæ ſalutis.*

o *Pigh. controuer. De fide & iuſtificatione.*

p *Ambroſ. de Iacob, & v. l. 2. cap. 2. Odoratus eſt odorem veſtimentorum. Forſaſſe illud eſt quia non operibus iuſtificamur, ſed fide: quoniam carnalis infirmitas operibus impedimento eſt; fidei autem claritas factorum obumbrat errorem quæ meretur veniam delictorum.*

q *Bernard. epiſt. 190. vt ſupra, Sect. 9.*

r *Ibid.*

*imputation, but euery one contracts his owne by taking fleſh from him.*
Babbling ſophiſter, if euery one contract guilt from *Adam* by taking fleſh from him, tell vs what it is whereof euery one is guiltie? Is it not of *Adams* ſinne, [r] *in whom all haue ſinned?* To bee borne in ſinne is the puniſhment of ſin, and there can bee no puniſhment but by former guilt, and there can bee no former guilt but of the ſinne of *Adam*. It remaineth therefore that our firſt guilt is by the imputation of *Adams* ſinne, and conſequently that our Iuſtification is by the imputation of the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, as on both ſides hath been alreadie more largely handled in the ſixt Section. I ſay nothing here more, but what *Auſtin* ſaith as touching infants new borne, [s] *They haue committed nothing in the branch, but in the root they are periſhed and loſt.* To the ſecond place cited by *M. Perkins*, he hath ſomewhat to anſwer by means of *M. Perkins* diſaduantage to himſelfe: [t] *It ſufficeth mee for all Righteouſneſſe, only to haue him mercifull vnto mee to whom onely I haue ſinned.* But what is the mercy here intended by *S. Bernard?* That appeareth by the other words, [u] *Gods pardon is mans Righteouſneſſe.* The mercie of God then that ſufficeth for all Righteouſneſſe is in the *forgiueneſſe and pardon of our ſins.* But *M. Perkins* tranſlating the words, *mans righteouſneſſe is the mercifulneſſe of God*, gaue *M. Biſhop* an aduantage to ſay, as if *Bernard* had ſpoken of Inherent righteouſneſſe, that *by Gods free grace and mercy it is beſtowed vpon vs.* But *S. Bernard* doth not ſay that mans Inherent righteouſneſſe by the gift of God, but Gods forgiueneſſe of mans ſinnes, is the righteouſneſſe of man in the ſight of God: and if the place had been rightly tranſlated, he had been further put to his ſhifts for anſwer to it. In the third place hee was quite grauelled, and knew not which way to get out, and therefore mentioneth nothing of it, leſt the Reader ſhould plainly diſcerne him to bea liar. But I will do him the fauour to ſet it downe once againe. [y] *I will ſing of the mercies of the Lord for euer*, ſaith *Bernard*. *Shall I ſing of mine owne Righteouſneſſe? Lord, I will remember (or will make mention of) thy Righteouſneſſe only: for that is mine alſo. For thou art made vnto me Righteouſneſſe of God. Am I to ſtand in feare leſt one (Righteouſneſſe) be not ſufficient for vs both? It is not a ſhort cloake, ſuch as cannot couer two. This Righteouſneſſe being large and euerlaſting, ſhall largely couer both thee and me. And*

[r] Rom. 5. 12.

[s] Aug. de verb. Dom ſer. 36. In ramo nihil adhuc commiſerunt, ſed in radice perierūt.

[t] Bern. in Cant. ſer. 23. Sufficit mihs ad omnem iuſtitiam ſolum habere propitium illum cui ſoli peccani.

[u] Ibid. Non peccare Dei iuſtitia eſt; hominis iuſtitia indulgentia Dei.

[y] Bern. in Cant. ſer. 61. Ego quoque miſericordias Domini in eternū cantabo. Nunquid iuſtitias meas? Domine memorabor iuſtitiæ tuæ ſolius. Ipſa eſt enim & mea, nempe factus es tu mihi iuſtitia à Deo. Nunquid verendum ne non vnus ambobus ſufficiat? Non eſt pallium breue quod ſecundum propheram non poſſit operire duos. Et te parit brevitas, et me operiet latitudo larga & aterna iuſtitia. Et in me quidem operuit multitudinem peccatorum; in te quid niſi pietatis theſauros, diuitias bonitatis.

in

*in me verily it covereth a multitude of sinnes, but in thee what but the treasures of pietie, the riches of goodnesse?* Now what doth Saint *Bernard* heere intend? Marrie saith *M. Bishop, that we have no iustice of our owne, that is, from our selves, but from the goodnesse of God, through the merits of Christs passion.* Yea but what is that iustice that he meaneth, that we have *from the goodnesse of God?* Forsooth he telleth vs, that it is *Inherent iustice, and that Saint Bernard speaketh thereof elswhere, as a distinct thing from the iustice of Christ.* What, and is that all that *S. Bernard* here saith? Giue ouer, *M. Bishop*, giue ouer for shame; striue no longer against your cõscience: your owne heart told you here, that you plaied the part of a leaud and wilfull man. The Righteousnesse here spoken of, is but *one*, and *onely* one: it is a Righteousnesse *sufficient* both *for Christ and vs*; it *covereth both Christ and vs*; it coucreth in vs *a multitude of sinnes*, and in him *the riches of mercy*, and is this meant of *Inherent righteousnesse?* Is our inherent righteousnesse sufficient both for Christ and vs? doth it couer both Christ and vs? But why doe I thus debate with a man altogether void of conscience and shame? *S. Bernard* expresly testifieth *the one Righteousnes of Christ*, which *only* we are to make mention of, as *being sufficient both for him and vs, couering in vs a multitude of sins*, so as that by it we are accepted for iust in the sight of God. But to make his matter seeme the better, hee referreth the Reader to the first Sermon of *Bernard* vpon the words of *Esay*, *Vidi Dominum*, there to see somewhat of Inherent iustice, whereas in that Sermon he hath nothing at al to that purpose, so that I should haue thought it mistaken, but that the margin and the text haue cited it both alike. And that it may appeare that he doth but gull and abuse his Reader, it is in the fifth of those very Sermons that *S. Bernard* hath affirmed, that [z] *our Righteousnesse, if we haue any, is not pure, and is by the Prophet compared to a defiled cloth*, as before was shewed: whence it followeth ineuitably, that our Inherent righteousnes is not that whereby we stand as iust in the sight of God. The sentence of *Austine* was not cited broken, but whole: [a] *He hath made our sinnes his sins, that he might make his righteousnesse our righteousnesse.* *M. Bishops* honesty appeareth as it is wont to doe, in leauing out that part of the sentence which should giue light to the rest; otherwise Saint *Austins* meaning would be plaine, that as Christ hath made our sinnes his, so he

z *Bern. de verb. Esa. ser. 5. Vt supra sect. 3.*

a *Aug. in Psa. 22. Delicta nostra sua delicta fecit, vt iustitiam suam nostram iustitiam faceret.*

he hath made his Righteouſneſſe ours, which is onely by imputation. As for his expoſition it is altogether abſurd, becauſe Chriſt by *meriting Inherent iuſtice or righteouſneſſe for vs*, hath not made his Righteouſneſſe ours, which is the thing that *S. Auſtin* affirmeth, but hath giuen vs, a Righteouſneſſe of our owne. The expoſition of the *iuſtice of God* which he citeth out of *Auſtin*, is wholy impertinent, becauſe the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, of which he ſaith that *Chriſt made his Righteouſneſſe our Righteouſneſſe*, is the *Righteouſneſſe* which Chriſt wrought for vs in his owne perſon, nor that which God worketh in vs for his ſake. The ſinne was wrought by vs, the Righteouſneſſe by him: he tooke to him our ſinne, and imparted his Righteouſneſſe vnto vs. And this Righteouſneſſe imputed vnto vs, is truly ſayd to be that *which God giueth to man, that man may be iuſt through God*, ſo that therein *S. Auſtin* howſoeuer ſaith nothing that is contrarie to our defence.

### 9. W. Bishop.

*Now let vs come to the reaſons of Catholikes, which* M. Perkins *calling the obiections, propoſeth for them, to proue, that the iuſtice which God beſtoweth vpon vs, is Inherent, and not imputed.*

## OF INHERENT IVSTICE.

*First obiect.* As one man cannot bee made wiſe, valiant, or continent by the wiſedome, valour, or continency of another, ſo one man cannot be made iuſt, by the iuſtice of another. M. Perkins *anſwereth*, That one mans iuſtice cannot bee made anothers, no more then life or health, but Chriſts iuſtice may, who by couenant of grace is made euery mans owne, with all his gifts.

Reply. *This anſwer ſalueth not the difficulty any whit at all, for Chriſts wiſedome, power, and other gifts are not imputed vnto vs, as it is euident. Why then is his iuſtice more then the reſt? wee confeſſe that in a good ſenſe all Chriſts gifts are ours, that is, they were all employed to purchaſe our redemption, and we do daily offer them to God, that he will for his Sonnes ſake more and more waſh vs from our ſinnes,*

*and*

*and beſtow his graces more plentifull vpon vs: thus are all Chriſts riches ours, ſo long as we keep our ſelues members of his myſtical body, but this is nothing to the point which the argument touched, how one man may formally be made iuſt by the iuſtice of another, rather then wiſe by the wiſedome of another.*

## R. ABBOT.

a 6 Bell. 6.

We haue[a] before heard it confeſſed by *Bellarmine*, that the ſin of *Adam* is imputed to all his poſterity, as if euery man had committed the ſame himſelfe, neither can they truly deſcribe the ſtate of *Originall ſinne* out of the doctrine of their owne ſchooles, but they muſt confeſſe ſo much. Now let them reſolue vs, how one man may be reputed to haue ſinned in the ſinne of another, and we will reſolue them how we may be reputed to haue wrought all Righteouſneſſe in the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt. Surely as *Adam* did beare the perſon of all mankind, and [b] *we all were that one man*, as S. *Auſtin* ſaith, and therfore what he did was as done by all and euery one, ſo did Chriſt beare the perſon of all the elect and faithfull, and was accounted as them all in one, [c] *not one that made the forfeiture, and another that made the ſatisfaction, becauſe one Chriſt is both the head and the body*, and therefore what hee did, likewiſe was as done by all and euery one. *M. Perkins* therfore rightly ſaid that Chriſt being made ours by the couenant of grace, wee one with him, and he with vs, albeit the Righteouſneſſe inherent in him cannot be inherent in vs, that we thereby ſhould be inherently iuſt, yet by imputation the ſame is deriued vnto vs, and we thereby and for his ſake are accepted, as if wee were inherently iuſt in moſt perfect and high degree. But ſaith *M. Biſhop, the wiſedome and power of Chriſt, and his other gifts are not imputed vnto vs: why then his iuſtice more then the reſt?* I anſwer him, that that onely is imputed vnto vs which by the couenant of grace is to be imputed, which onely hath reaſon of imputation. Although Chriſt be wholy ours, that is, for vs and for our vſe vnto Saluation, yet by imputation he is ours onely, in that which by way of humiliation and obedience he hath vndertaken and performed for vs. That, I ſay, is imputed vnto vs of Chriſt, which Chriſt is meerly and onely for vs; what he is abſolutely of himſelfe, it is not imputed vnto vs, albeit

b *Auguſt. de peccat. mer. & remiſſ. lib. 3. cap. 7. Adhuc omnes ille vnus fuerunt.*

c *Bernard. epiſt. 190. Non alter eſt qui forefecit alter qui ſatisfecit, quia caput & corpus vnus eſt Chriſtus.*

beit his infinite wiſdome and power, and prudence, and whatſoeuer hee is of himſelfe, haue concurred to the doing of that that ſhould be imputed vnto vs, and doe concurre to the effecting and maintaining of thoſe benefits, which of that imputation are to ariſe vnto vs. But the wiſdome and power of Chriſt, as they are in his humane nature a part of the image of God, and of that righteouſneſſe whereby man ſhould be wiſe to know, and able to doe what concerneth him towards God, are impured vnto vs as a part of his Righteouſneſſe, and thereby he acquitteth our ignorances and errors, our weakneſſes and frailties, that the ſame ſtand not againſt vs in the ſight of God. And thus one may be reputed wiſe by the wiſdome of another, and iuſt by the iuſtice of another, becauſe where any thing is in nature of duty and debt, it is at the diſcretion of him to whom it is due, to accept one mans performance thereof for diſcharge of the other. Yea, but ſaith *M. Biſhop, this is nothing to the argument, how one man may be formally iuſt by the iuſtice of another.* And I anſwere him, that their obiection is a formall foolery, grounded vpon a witleſſe ſuppoſall of that which no man is ſo witleſſe as to imagine. Wee ſay that a man may be formally iuſt two manner of waies. A man is one way *formally iuſt in qualitie*, another way *formally iuſt in law. Formally iuſt in qualility*, is he in whom is found the perfect inward forme and qualitie of iuſtice and Righteouſneſſe without ſpot or ſtaine; and thus it were abſurd indeed, to ſay that a man may be *formally iuſt* by the iuſtice of another, becauſe the inherent quality of one ſubiect, cannot become the inherent quality of another. But in *courſe of law and iudgement*, the forme of iuſtice is, not to be ſubiect to crime or accuſation, and he *is formally iuſt*, againſt whom no action or accuſation is liable by law. Now it is true indeed that euery one that is *formally iuſt in quality*, is alſo *formally iuſt in law*; but yet a man may be *formally iuſt in law*, who by inherent forme and qualitie is not iuſt. For in this ſort a man becommeth iuſt by pardon and forgiueneſſe, becauſe pardon being obtained, the law proceedeth no further, and all imputation of the offence in law, is taken away as if it had neuer been committed. And this is the ſtate of our iuſtice and Righteouſneſſe in the ſight of God, that through the imputation of the merit and ſatisfaction of Ieſus Chriſt our ſinnes are forgiuen vs, and thereby no accuſation is liable againſt vs, either as hauing

done

done what we ought not to doe, or not done what we ought to do,
[d] Rom. 8. 33. according to the words of the Apoſtle, [d] *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect?* if we reſpect inherent qualitie, there is inough to charge him with, but by forgiueneſſe of ſinnes the ſame becommeth as if it had neuer been. In a word therefore, we are not *formally iuſt in quality*, if God iudge vs thereby, being ſtained and defiled in all the Righteouſneſſe that we haue; but we are *formally iuſt in law*, by the imputation of the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, for that thereby a ſatisfaction is interpoſed, and our ſinnes are remitted and pardoned, ſo that there is no let but that God mercifully for his ſake accepteth vs vnto euerlaſting life.

## IO. W. BISHOP.

2. *Obiection.* If we bee righteous, or iuſt by the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt imputed vnto vs, then is euery iuſt man as righteous as Chriſt himſelfe, hauing the ſame iuſtice his, which is Chriſts, but that is too too abſurd, *Ergo:* M. Perkins *anſwer.* Chriſts Righteouſneſſe is not applied vnto vs in the ſame meaſure as it is in Chriſt, in him it is infinite, but of it ſo much is applied to this or that man, as will ſerue for his iuſtification. And to helpe this anſwer forward, I wil adde his marginall note, euen as any ſtarre partakes the whole light of the Sunne, with the reſt ſo farre forth as the light makes it to ſhine.

Reply. *That which is applied of Chriſts iuſtice, to this or that man, is either infinite, and then the man is as iuſt as Chriſt: for there can be no greater then infinite in the ſame kind. Or it is not infinit, but in a certaine meaſure as he ſeemeth to grant, and then it is no part of Chriſts infinite iuſtice, for all the parts of an infinite thing are infinite, according vnto true Philoſophie. It remaineth then that a certaine limitted portion of iuſtice is deriued out of Chriſts infinit iuſtice, and powred into this or that man, as in his owne example,* The light of euery ſtarre is receiued from the Sunne beames: *yet is not the light in the ſtarre, the ſame which is in the Sunne, for one accident cannot be in two ſubiects ſo farre diſtant, neither is it of like vertue to lighten the skies, as it is euident: but is a farre dimmer light, ſomewhat like vnto that of the Sunne from whence it came. Euen ſo in our iuſtification from the Sonne of iuſtice Chriſt Ieſus, certaine beames of particular iuſtice are*

*conueied*

*conueied into this or that mans ſoule, whereby it is both lightned by faith, and inflamed by charity: but there is exceeding difference betweene their two iuſtices, more then there is betweene the light of the Sunne, and the light of a ſtarre; which* S. Auguſtine *in expreſſe tearmes deliuereth, ſaying:* How much difference there is betweene the light that doth lighten, and that which is lightened, that is, the Sun and the ſtarre light, ſo much difference is there betweene the iuſtice that doth iuſtifie, and that iuſtice which is made by that iuſtification: *to wit, betweene the iuſtice of Chriſt, and that which is in euery good Chriſtian.* *Lib. 12. conf. cap. 15.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Biſhops* learning might here haue informed him, but that his will outranne his wit, that the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, as he is man, is not infinite, becauſe it is the Righteouſneſſe of a finite creature, which is not capeable of that that is infinite. True Diuinity diſtinguiſheth the things of the manhood, from the things of the godhead, the one finite, the other infinite; thereby to vphold the integritie of two natures in the one perſon of Ieſus Chriſt. Yea, and the righteouſneſſe of the manhood of Chriſt, as I conceiue, may two waies be conſidered, either abſolutely as in himſelfe, or reſpectiuely as for vs. The abſolute Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, though it be finite, yet is next to that that is infinite, being aboue all the righteouſneſſe of men and Angels, in that the [a] *ſpirit was giuen him without meaſure*, and therefore his perfections were the vttermoſt that a creature in any ſort can be capeable of. But the reſpectiue or diſpenſatiue Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, is that whereby he is [b] *iuſt for men*, as *S. Bernard* ſpeaketh; the righteouſneſſe which he performed for vs in fulfilling the law, [c] *being made vnder the law* to redeeme vs. According to this Righteouſneſſe therefore it is true, that by the imputation of the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, we are as righteous as Chriſt, not abſolutely, but as Chriſt was for vs in fulfilling the law. The infinite value and force of which Righteouſneſſe in Chriſt, aroſe not from any infiniteneſſe of it ſelfe, being but the righteouſneſſe of the law, which is but the deſcription of that image of God to which man was firſt created, and ought to be in man, but it aroſe from the infiniteneſſe of the perſon.

[a] Iohn 3.34.

[b] *Bernard. in Cant. ſer. 70. Iuſtus probemibus.*

[c] Gal. 4.4.

perſon of him by whom it was performed, being both God and man, and thereby is of that large extent to iuſtifie all, and to purchaſe euerlaſting life to all that doe beleeue in him. Rightly therefore doth *M. Perkins* ſay, that the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt is not applied to euery particular man according to the infinite value of it ſelfe, becauſe that infiniteneſſe proceeded not of the nature of it ſelfe, but according to that meaſure whereby it appertaineth to vs, which is deſcribed in the law. Neither is his compariſon of the Sunne and the ſtarres further to be ſtrained, but onely to ſhew that euery thing that receiueth from another, receiueth according to the ſtint and meaſure of it ſelfe: he neuer meant that the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt which is imputed vnto vs, is deriued to vs to be actually inherent in vs, as the light of the Sunne is deriued from it to be actually inherent in the ſtarres. Yet we deny not, but that the beams of inherent Righteouſneſſe are deriued vnto vs by regeneration and new birth through the ſpirit of Ieſus Chriſt, but that is not the Righteouſneſſe here ſpoken of, and *M. Biſhop* might take occaſion out of his owne words to call it *a dimme light*, as indeed it is more dim and darke then that by it wee can finde the way to God and euerlaſting life.

## 11. W. BISHOP.

*The third reaſon for the Catholike party. If men be made truly and really iuſt by Chriſts iuſtice, imputed vnto them, in like manner Chriſt ſhould be made really vniuſt, by the iniquitie and ſinnes of men imputed vnto him. For there is no reaſon to the contrary, but one may as well be made vniuſt by imputation, as iuſt; eſpecially conſidering that euill is made more eaſily, and more waies then good.* M. Perkins *anſwer is, that we may ſay Chriſt was a ſinner truly, not becauſe he had ſinne in him, but becauſe our ſinnes were laid on his ſhoulders. That reaſon is naught, for he is not truly a ſinner, that paies the debt of ſinnes, which an innocent and moſt iuſt perſon may performe: but hee that either hath ſinne truly in him, or is ſo by imputation ſtrucken, that the ſinnes are made his owne really, and he in all cáſes to bee dealt withall, as if he ſinned himſelfe: as they hold that one iuſtified by imputation of Chriſts iuſtice, is really in Gods ſight iuſt, and is both loued in this life, and ſhall be rewarded in the next, as if he were truly iuſt indeed: But to anoueh*

*our*

*our Saviour Christ to bee so a sinner, is to say that he was averted from God, the slaue of the diuell, and sonne of perdition, which is plaine blasphemie. Thus sentence out of the Prophet,* He was counted with sinners, *is expounded by the Enangelists, that hee was so taken indeed, but by a wicked Iudge, and a reprobate people. And therefore if you allow of their sentence, range your selfe with them, as one of their number. S.* Chrysostome *by him produced, confirmeth the same, saying, that God permitted him to be condemned as a sinner, not that hee was one truly. Christ I know is called sinne by S.* Paul, *but by a figure, signifying that he was a sacrifice for sinne, as hath beene before declared. The same blessed Apostle when he speaketh properly, affirmeth in plaine termes, that Christ was tempted like vnto vs, in all things excepting sinne.* Heb. 4.

Is. 53.

R. ABBOT.

*M. Perkins* yeeldeth, that as we are called righteous by the Righteousnesse of Christ, so Christ might be called a sinner by our sinnes, not by hauing the blemish and corruption thereof, but onely the guilt and imputation, euen as hee becommeth truly a debtor that vndertaketh anothers debt. *M. Bishop* saith, that *an innocent and most iust person may pay the debt of sinne*, and such a one do we acknowledge the Sonne of God to bee, who yet beeing iust and innocent, might by *M. Bishops* owne confession, bee termed (being rightly vnderstood) *a sinner*, because he saith that he may be called *truely a sinner, who is so by imputation stricken, as that the sinnes are made his owne really, and he in all cases to bee dealt with as if he had sinned himselfe.* For thus was the case with Christ, who really though not inherently, took vpon him our sinnes, by vndertaking really as in our person the guilt thereof, and therefore being dealt with as if hee himselfe had committed the same. Therefore doth *Hierome* apply these words to Christ, [a] *Thou hast brought vpon mee that wrath and storme of thy furie which thou wast to poure out vpon the nations, because I haue taken vpon mee their sins.* So *Hilarie* saith that [b] *all the terror of the tempest that raged against vs, lighted (or lay) vpon him.* Therefore in right meaning to say that Christ was made *a sinner* in the bearing of our sinnes, is not to affirme that *Christ was averted from God, the slaue of the diuell,*

[a] *Hieron in Psal 87. Vt supra sect. 5.*

[b] *Hilar. in Psalm. 68. Omnis in eum terror descendit in nos tempestatis incubuit.*

*and sonne of perdition*, as *M. Bishop* ignorantly collecteth, because these are consequents onely of inherent corruption and sinne, whereby a man is borne in sinne, according to the depraued image of him of whom hee is borne, and not euery one to whom sinne is imputed, but [c] *whosoeuer committeth sinne is of the diuell*. Therefore the Fathers in that sense that hereis spoken of, haue not forborne to terme Christ *a sinner*, in respect as hee tooke vpon him the imputation of our sinnes. So saith *Oecumenius*: [d] *Christ was greatly a sinner, as who did take vpon him the sinnes of the whole world, and make them proper to himselfe. For that Christ was a sinner heare the Apostle, He made him sinne for vs*, &c. Vpon which words of the Apostle *Chrysostome* also saith, not only as *M. Bishop* citeth, that *God permitted him to be condemned as a sinner*, but also as *M. Perkins* alledgeth, though *M. Bishop* vnhonestly dissembleth it, [e] *He made the iust a sinner, that he might make sinners iust*. In like sort *Hierome* as in one place he saith, that [f] *Christ accounteth our sinnes his sinnes*, so in another place he affirmeth, that [g] *Christ did professe himselfe a sinner, in that he bare our sinnes*. So saith also Saint *Austin*, [h] *Christ after a sort sinned in thy infirmity: hee mentioned thy sinnes out of his owne mouth, and called them his sinnes*. All this the Prophet *Esay* confirmeth when he saith, i *He was counted with the transgressors*, which was not onely by a wicked iudge and a reprobate people, as *M. Bishop* mentioneth, but in that *God made him sinne*, God counted him with sinners, and therefore layed vpon him *the curse* of sinners, in that he was [k] *hanged on a tree*, for the [l] *curse of God is vpon him that is hanged*. Therefore the Prophet in the same place saith, that [m] *the Lord did lay vpon him our iniquities; the Lord would breake him & make him subiect to infirmities*, that we may vnderstand that God did not onely leaue him to the hands of men, but himselfe counted him with sinners, by the bearing of our sinnes, and therefore dealt with him himselfe accordingly, so that he had cause to cry out, [n] *Thine indignation lieth hard vpon me, and thou hast vexed me with all thy flormes*; [o] *Lord why abhorrest thou my soule, and hidest thy face from me?* [p] *Thy wrathfull displeasure goeth ouer me, and the feare of thee hath vndone mee*. Yet as touching the person of Christ in himselfe, we acknowledge it as farre as *M. Bishop*, that he was [q] *excepted from sinne*, that hee was [r] *holy, harmelesse, vndefiled, separated from sinners*: and because to apply vnto

c 1. Ioh. 3. 8.
d *Oecumen. in Heb. cap. 9. Etenim Christus vehementer peccator erat, vt qui totius mundi peccata assumpserat sibique propria fecerat*, &c. *Quod enim Christus peccator fuerit, audi; Eum qui peccatum*, &c.
e *Chrysost. vt supra sect. 5.*
f *Hier. in Psal. 21. Peccata nostra sua reputat.*
g *Idem in Psal. 37. Peccatorem se profitetur qui peccata nostra portauit.*
h *August. in Psal. 37. Tanquam peccauit in infirmitate tua Christus. Modo enim peccata tua tanquam ex ore suo dicebat & ex dicebat sua.*
i Esa. 53. 12.
k Gal. 3. 13. Act. 5. 30.
l Deut. 21. 23.
m Esa 53. 6. 10.
n Psal. 88. 6. Applied to Christ by Athanas. *De interpret. Psal.* by Arnob. and Hierome in Psal. 87.
o Vers. 14.
p Vers. 16.
q Heb. 4. 15.
r Cap. 7. 26.

vnto Chriſt the name of *a ſinner* in what ſort ſoeuer is ſubiect to miſunderſtanding and offenſe, we wholly forbeare the ſame, and as though a man by taking vpon him another mans debt, be become a debtor, yet we call him not a debtor, but *a ſurety*, and doe name what befalleth him to befall him by *ſuretiſhip*, and not by *debt*, ſo doe we content our ſelues to ſay with ſafetie, that Chriſt did *beare our ſinnes*, and *ſuffered for our ſinnes*, or with the Apoſtle, *was made ſinne for vs*, but the name of ſinner wee doe not giue vnto him.

## 12. W. BISHOP.

4. *Obiect.* If a man be righteous onely by imputation, he may together be full of iniquity: whereupon it muſt needs follow, that God doth take for iuſt and good, him that is both vniuſt and wicked: but that is abſurd, when Gods iudgement is according to truth. *Here* M. Perkins *yeeldeth*, That when God doth impute Chriſts iuſtice vnto any man, he doth together ſanctifie the partie, giuing Originall ſinne a deadly wound. *And yet elſewhere he ſaid*, That Originall ſinne, which remained after iuſtification in the partie, did beare ſuch ſway, that it infected all the workes of the ſaid partie, and made him miſerable, &c. *But it is good hearing of amendment, if he will abide in it. Let vs goe on.*

Of Originall ſinne. Pag. 31.

## R. ABBOT.

It had beene ſtrange if *M. Biſhop* could haue ſet downe this argument without *full of iniquitie*; for it had not otherwiſe ſufficiently filled his mouth. But we deny, that if a man be *righteous only by imputation* (ſpeaking as wee doe of perfect righteouſneſſe in the ſight of God) it muſt follow, that he is ſtil *full of iniquitie* as before, becauſe iuſtification in the ſight of God by the imputatiõ of Chriſts merits, is alwaies accompanied with the ſanctification of the holy Ghoſt, whereby *the inward qualitie of the man*, [a] *though not wholly, yet in part*, is altered and changed, and is thence-foorth

[a] *Aug. de peccat. mer. & remiſſ. lib. 1. cap. 27. Hominis qualitatem non totam continuò mutari, &c.*

further to be renewed *from day to day*. *In part*, I say, because together with this sanctification there is still a remainder of *originall corruption*, by the touch and staine whereof the holinesse and newnesse that is wrought in vs is defiled, and standeth in need of mercie and fauour to accept it: which made *Gregory* the Bishop of Rome to say, b *All the righteousnesse of man is prooued to be vnrighteousnesse if it be strictly iudged: therefore a man needeth praier after Righteousnesse, that that which being sifted might quaile, by the only mercie of the Iudge may stand for good.* For although it be true that *Originall sinne* haue receiued a *deadly wound*, yet it followeth not thereof, that it is straightwaies wholly dead. It is dead indeed, c *as touching the guilt of it*, as *Austine* saith, but it is not yet dead as touching corruption and infection, and therefore doth indeed infect the workes of the regenerate, and by lusting and rebelling giueth him occasion to cry out with the Apostle, d *Miserable man that I am, who shall deliuer me from the body of this death?* This *M. Perkins* vniformely teacheth: he doth not here amend what hee had said before, because in the former place there was nothing to amend, and therefore it was but *M. Bishops* dreame, that made him imagine a contradiction there where all things well agree and stand together.

b *Greg. Moral. lib. 9. cap. 11. Omnis humana iustitia iniustitia esse conuincetur si districtè iudicetur. Prece ergo post iustitiam indiget, vt quæ succumbere discussa poterat, sola iudicis pietate conualescat.*

c *Aug. cont. Iulian. lib. 2. Mortuus est in eo reatu quo non tenebat, &c.*

d Rom. 7. 24.

## 13. W. BISHOP.

5. Obiect. *Our fifth reason is inuerted by* M. Perkins, *but may be rightly framed thus*: Christ restored vs that Iustice which wee lost by *Adams* fall: But by him we lost inherent iustice: *Ergo*, By him wee are restored to Inherent iustice. *The* Maior *is gathered out of Saint* Paul, *who affirmeth, that wee receiue more by Christ then wee lost by* Adam: *and is Saint* Irenæus, *and Saint* Augustines *most expresse doctrine, who say*, How are wee said to bee renewed, if we receiue not againe which the first man lost, &c. Immortalitie of the body we receiue not, but we receiue iustice, from the which he fell through sinne.

Rom. 5.

*Lib. 3. cap. 20. lib. 6. de gen. 24. 26. 25.*

R. ABBOT.

R. ABBOT.

This obiection proueth nothing that we deny, being vnderſtood according to the meaning of *Auſtin* and *Irenæus*, whom he alledgeth. Chriſt came to reſtore to vs that which we loſt in *Adam*. But in *Adam* wee loſt inherent iuſtice. Therefore Chriſt came to reſtore the ſame. We affirme the ſame, and ſay that what Chriſt came to doe, he beginneth to doe, and to bring to effect in euery man that is iuſtified, but in no man doth he perfect it ſo long as we continue in this life, and therefore inherent iuſtice is not ſuch in any man here, as that thereby he can be found iuſt in the ſight of God. Now therefore whereas *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *Chriſt reſtored vs that iuſtice which we loſt by Adams fall*, if hee meane it as the Apoſtle doth when he ſaith, that [a]*God hath quickened vs together with Chriſt, and hath raiſed vs vp together, and hath made vs ſit together in the heauenly places in Chriſt Ieſus*, that is, [b]*not yet really, but in hope*, as *S. Auſtin* ſpeaketh, we admit the propoſition to be true, and it is nothing againſt vs. But if his meaning be, that Chriſt hath really and already in poſſeſſion reſtored vnto vs what we loſt in *Adam*, the propoſition is abſurdly falſe, and all this diſcourſe tendeth to proue the contrary.

[a] Epheſ. 2. 6.

[b] *Auguſt. de bapt. cont. Donatiſt. lib. 1. cap. 4. Nondum iure ſed in ſpe.*

14. W. BISHOP.

*The ſixth and laſt reaſon for Catholikes is*, The iuſtice of the faithfull is eternall, dureth after this life, and is crowned in heauen; but Chriſts imputed iuſtice ceaſeth in the end of this life. *Ergo.*

M. Perkins *anſwereth. Firſt, that imputed Righteouſneſſe continueth with vs for euer, and that in heauen we ſhall haue no other. Secondly, that perhaps in the end of this life, inward Righteouſneſſe ſhall be perfect, and then without perhaps it ſhall be moſt perfect in heauen. So that one part of this anſwere ouerthroweth the other. Wherefore I need not ſtand vpon it, but will proceed to fortifie our partie, with ſome authorities, taken both forth of the holy Scriptures, and ancient Fathers. The firſt place I take out of theſe words of Saint* Paul: And theſe things certes, were you, (Drunkards, Couetous, Fornicators, &c.) But you are Waſhed, you are Sanctified, you are Iuſtified

1. Cor 6.

Iuſtified in the name of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, and in the ſpirit of our Lord: *Here Iuſtification by the beſt interpreters iudgement is defined, to conſiſt in thoſe actions of waſhing vs from our ſinnes, and of infuſion of Gods holy gifts by the holy Ghoſt, in the name and for the ſake of Chriſt Ieſus.*

*S. Chryſo. Ambr. & Theophilac. in hunc locum.*

Tit. 3. *The like deſcription of our Iuſtification is in* S. Paul. Of his mercy he hath ſaued vs by the lauer of regeneration, and renewing of the holy Ghoſt, whom hee hath powred into vs abundantly, through Ieſus Chriſt our Sauior, that being iuſtified by his grace, we may be heires in hope (and not in certainty of faith) of life euerlaſting. *Where the Apoſtle inferring that being iuſtified by his grace, declareth that in the words before he had deſcribed the ſame Iuſtification, to conſiſt in our new birth of Baptiſme, and the renewing of our ſoules, by the infuſion of his heauenly gifts, which God of his mercie did beſtow vpon vs for his Son Chriſts ſake. Many other places I omit for breuity ſake, and will be content to cite fewe Fathers, becauſe the beſt learned of our aduerſaries doe confeſſe that they be all againſt them, as I haue ſhewed before.*

*De peccat. merit. & remiſ. cap. 15. Epiſt. 85. lib. 12. de Trinit. cap. 7. Lib. 6. de Trinit.* *Firſt, Saint* Auguſtine *ſaith,* That this iuſtice of ours, (*which they call righteouſneſſe*) is the grace of Chriſt, regenerating vs by the holy Ghoſt; and is a beauty of our inward man. It is the renewing of the reaſonable part of our ſoule. *And twenty other ſuch like, whereby he manifeſtly declareth our iuſtice to be inherent, and not the imputed iuſtice of Chriſt. Let him ſuffice for the Latine fathers. and Saint* Cyril *for the Greeks, who of our iuſtification writeth thus.* The ſpirit is a heate, who as ſoone as he hath powred charity into vs, and hath with the fire of it, inflamed our minds, we haue euen then obtained iuſtice.

## R. Abbot.

a Eccleſ. 19. 24. *a There is a ſubtilitie that is ſine,* ſaith *Eccleſiaſticus, but it is vnrighteous, and there is that wreſteth the open and manifeſt law. M. Biſhop* is none of thoſe that deale finely, that will cogge by arte, and will lie, and yet not ſeeme to lie: what he doth he will doe outright, and will lie ſo as that euery man may ſee him to be a liar, that he may not be taken for other then indeed he is. Tell vs *M. Biſhop,* where is it that *M. Perkins* ſaith, that *in heauen we ſhall haue*

*no other but imputed iustice or Righteousnesse?* where doth he make any shew or semblance of saying so? Fie, *M. Bishop*, fie for shame; leaue this lying and belying of men, a good cause needeth no such meanes for the vpholding of it; they that in apparent vntruth see you thus wilfull and shameles, cannot but take you for a cosiner in all the rest. *M. Perkins* saith, that *imputed Righteousnesse continueth for euer*, but doth he say that *in heauen there shall be no other*, who plainely saith, that *sanctification shall be perfect in the world to come*? Wee shall for euer enioy eternall life, by vertue of that whereby we are first admitted vnto it, because thereby wee are admitted to it to enioy it thereby for euer. But hee who by his merit purchased for vs eternall life, purchased for vs also to bee made meete for the enioying of it, and therefore shall then make vs vnto himselfe b *a glorious Church, not hauing spot or wrinckle or any such thing*, but c *God shall be all in all*. Whereas hee maketh *M. Perkins* to say, that *perhaps inward Righteousnesse shall be perfect in the end of this life*, he againe abuseth him: for he asketh the question onely as a supposition, what if it bee so, but maketh no *perhaps* that it is so; denying that if it were so we could bee iustified thereby. The rest of this section as touching the maine drift of it is altogether impertinent, tending to proue Inherent iustice, which wee denie not, but onely the perfection thereof in this life. But whereas hee seeketh to make good, that our *iustification* consisteth therein, hee commeth much too short, and one of his proofs directly prooueth the contrary. For when the Apostle saith, d *You are washed, you are sanctified; you are iustified*, vndoubtedly he meant not by *iustification* and *sanctification* to import one and the same thing. But there is no question, but that by sanctification is ment inherent iustice. Therefore inherent iustice cannot bee vnderstood in *iustification*. And this is apparent by those very authors whom hee himselfe citeth for exposition of the place, as namely *Chrysostome*, saying, e *He washed vs; and what, did he so onely? Nay, but hee also sanctified vs; and not this onely, but also he iustified vs*: very plainely putting difference betwixt *iustification* and *sanctification*, and expounding *iustification* in the next words to be this, *liberari à peccatis, to bee deliuered from sinnes*. So doth *Theophylact* also expresly referre *iustification* to forgiuenesse of sinnes: f *When he had first washed you, and by iustification had pardoned you, forthwith also hee be-*

b Ephe. 5. 27.
c 1. Cor. 15. 28.
d 1. Cor. 6. 11.
e *Chrys. in 1. Cor. cap. 6. hom. 16. Ablust nos: nunquid igitur hoc solum? Munus, sed sanctificauit. neque hoc etiam, sed iustificauit. Atqui liberari à peccatis magnum munus est, nunc autem te etiam innumeris impleuit bonis.*
f *Theop. in 1. Cor ca. 6. Vocille sanctificat. Quo pacto? Iustificando inquit. Cum enim prius vos ablusisset & iustitia condonasset, mox & sanctimoniam contulit.*

*ſtowed ſanctification. Oecumenius* likewiſe ſcuereth them as *Chryſoſtome* doth: [g]*He hath not onely waſhed you, but alſo ſanctified you; and not that only, but alſo iuſtified you.* He citeth *Ambroſe* alſo, but *Ambroſe* ſaith not one word, to import that *Iuſtification* ſhould be conſtrued of inherent iuſtice. [h]*In baptiſme all ſinnes being done away, the beleeuer is waſhed, is iuſtified in the name of the Lord, and by the ſpirit of our God is adopted to be a ſonne of God.* Now we may ſee what credit is to be giuen to this gameſter, who ſhewing his cardes in packe, telleth vs he hath wonne the game, when he hath nothing at all to helpe for the winning of it. As for the other place to *Titus*, *That being iuſtified by his grace, &c.* there is no argument to proue the contrary, but that the Apoſtle may comprehend the whole worke of *ſauing vs*, which he before mentioneth, vnder the name of *Iuſtification*, as the maine point whereupon dependeth all the reſt. But more properly we may take it in the third place, as in the former text to the Corinthians, diſtinguiſhed from the ſanctification and renewing of the holy Ghoſt, and expreſſing the other ſpeciall effect of the *waſhing of the new birth*, conſiſting in *the forgineneſſe of our ſinnes*. The places of *Auſtin* and *Cyril* being ſpoken of inherent iuſtice begunne in this life, not denied by vs, ſay nothing againſt vs. How trecherouſly and falſly he dealeth in ſaying, that the *beſt learned of our ſide doe confeſſe, that the Fathers be all againſt vs*, hath been ſhewed before, and it ſhall appeare God willing throughout this whole booke, that there is no cauſe for them ſo to ſay.

[g] *Oecumen. ibid. Nec id ſolum verum etiam ſanctificauit, neque hoc tantum ſed & iuſtificauit.*

[h] *Ambroſ. ibid. Illic omnibus peccatis abluitur credens, iuſtificatur Dei nomine, & per ſpiritum Dei noſtri Deo filius adoptatur.*

### 15. W. Bishop.

The ſecond difference about the maner of Iuſtification.

*WE all agree in generall, that faith concurreth to our Iuſtification, but differ in three points. Firſt, how faith is to be taken. Secondly, how it worketh in our iuſtification. Thirdly, whether it alone doth iuſtifie.*

*Concerning the firſt point, Catholikes hold a iuſtifying faith to be that Chriſtian faith, by which we beleeue the articles of our Creed, and all other things reuealed by God. The Proteſtants auerre it to be a particular faith, whereby they apply to themſelues the promiſes of righteouſneſſe, and of life euerlaſting by Chriſt. This to be the true iuſtifying faith, Maſter* Perkins *ſaith he hath proued already: hee ſhould*

*haue*

*haue done well, to haue noted the place, for I know not where to seeke it: but he will here adde a reason or twaine.*

1 *Reason.* The faith whereby we liue, is the faith whereby we are iustified: but the faith whereby we liue, is a particular faith, whereby we apply Christ to our selues, *as* Paul *saith*, I liue, *that is spiritually*, by the faith of the Sonne of God, which faith he sheweth to be a particular faith in Christ, in the words following, Who hath loued me, and giuen himselfe for me particularly. Gal. 2. 20.

Answer. *The* Maior *I admit, and deny the* Minor: *and say, that the proofe is not to purpose. For in the* Minor *he speaketh of faith, whereby we apply Christs merits vnto our selues, making them ours, in the proofe Saint* Paul *saith onely, that Christ died for him in particular. He makes no mention of his apprehending of Christs iustice, and making of it his own, which are very distinct things. All Catholikes beleeue with Saint* Paul, *that Christ died, as for all men in generall, so for euery man in particular, yea and that his loue was so exceeding great towards mankind, that he would willingly haue bestowed his life, for the redemption of one only man. But hereupon it doth not follow, that euery man may lay hands vpon Christs righteousnesse, and apply it to himselfe (or else Turkes, Iewes, Heretikes, and euill Catholikes, might make very bold with him) but must first doe these things which he requires at their hands, to be made partakers of his inestimable merits: as to repent them heartily of their sinnes, to beleeue and hope in him, to be baptized, and to haue a full purpose to obserue all his commandements. Which* M. Perkins *also confesseth that all men haue not only promised, but also vowed in baptisme. Now because we are not assured that we shall performe all this, therefore wee may not so presumptuously apply vnto our selues, Christs righteousnesse, and life euerlasting, although wee beleeue that he died for euery one of vs in particular. That which followeth,* M. Perkins, *hath no colour of probability: that Saint* Paul *in this manner of beliefe, that is, in applying to himselfe Christs merits, was an example vnto all that are saued. See the places, good Reader, and learne to beware the bold vnskilfulnesse of sectaries. For there is not a word sounding that way, but onely how he hauing receiued mercy, was made an example of patience.* Pag. 152. 1. Tim. 1. 16. Phil. 3. 15.

R. ABBOT.

R. Abbot.

That the act of true faith is particularly to apply, hath beene handled before in the queſtion of *the Certainty of Saluatiõ*. but yet the place ſo requiring, *M. Perkins* though fit heere to ſet downe ſome few reaſons for further proofe thereof. The firſt whereof is grounded vpon the words of *S. Paul*: [a] *I liue by the faith of the Son of God, who hath loued mee, and giuen himſelfe for mee. M. Biſhops* exception is, that *S. Paul* ſpeaketh not *of faith, wherby we apply Chriſts merits or iuſtice vnto our ſelues making them ours, but faith onely that Chriſt died for him in particular.* But what? is not the death of Chriſt a part, yea and a principall part of the merit of Chriſt? With vs it is ſo, and *M. Biſhop* we ſuppoſe when he is well aduiſed, conceiueth no otherwiſe. If then the Apoſtle ſpeake of faith, apprehending and applying vnto vs particularly the death of Chriſt, he ſpeaketh of faith, apprehending and applying vnto vs particularly the merit of Chriſt. And all parts of the merit of Chriſt, are parts alſo with vs of the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt. As his obedience in [b] *being baptized for vs* was his [c] *righteouſneſſe*, ſo his [d] *obedience* in *dying* for vs, was his righteouſnes alſo. Therfore faith applying vnto vs particularly the death of Chriſt, applieth vnto vs particularly the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt. Now *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that *al Catholikes beleeue with* S. Paul, *that Chriſt died as for all mẽ in general, ſo for euery man in particular of his exceeding great loue towards mankind.* But tel vs further *M. Biſhop*, was that all that *S. Paul* meant, that Chriſt loued him as he loued all men; he died for him as he died for all men? Was this *S. Pauls* faith, Chriſt loued me as he loued *Iudas* the traitour; he died for me as he died for *Simon Magus*? It is written concerning *Eſau*, [e] *I haue hated Eſau*, and in him a patterne of al reprobates is ſet forth vnto vs; and might *Eſau* ſay as well as *Paul*, *Chriſt hath loued me, and giuen himſelfe for me*? Indeed as *S. Auſtin* ſaith, [f] *as touching the greatneſſe and ſufficiency of the price, & one cõmon cauſe or condition of mankind, the bloud of Chriſt is the redemption of the whole world*; but yet as he further addeth, *there is a propriety of this redemption on their part from whom the Prince of this world is caſt forth, and who are not now veſſels of the dwell but members of Chriſt, neither did he beſtow his death vpon mankind, that they alſo that were not to bee regenerated, ſhould belong to his redemption.* Chriſt in his death

a Gal. 2. 20.

b *Ambroſ. in Pſ. 118. ſer. 8. Baptizatus pro nobis.*
c Mat. 3. 15.
d Phil. 2. 8.
e Rom. 9. 13.
f *Auguſt. ad articul. ſibi falſo impoſit. ar. 1. Quod ad magnitudinem et potentiã pretij, & quod ad vnam pertinet cauſam generis humani, ſanguis Chriſti redemptio eſt totius mundi, &c. Redemptionis proprietas haud dubiũ penes illos eſt de quibus princeps huius mundi miſſus eſt foras, et iam non membra diaboli, ſed vaſa ſunt Chriſti. Cuius mors non impetrat eſt humano generi vt ad redemptionem eius veniã qui regerandi non erant pertineant, &c.*

death intended a price of ſuch extent in value and worth, as ſhould be of power and ableneſſe to ſaue all, and therefore ſhould be offered indifferently to all; but yet in *loue* he paied this price only for them, to whom of loue he entended fruit and benefit thereby, in loue he gaue his[g] *ſoule or life a redemption for many, he ſhed his bloud for many,*[h] *not for all*, ſaith Hierome, *but for many, that is, for them that ſhould be willing to beleeue*, who are,[i] *ſo many as are ordained vnto eternall life*. If he had loued *Iudas*, he would haue loued him to the end, becauſe[k] *whom he loued, he loued to the end*. If hee had loued vniuerſally al, he would haue praied for al, but now there is a *world* of men, of whom he ſaith,[l] *I pray not for the world, but for them which thou haſt giuen me*[m] *out of the world*, that we may know that there is[n] *a world which God loueth*, euen[o] *the world which Chriſt hath gained by his bloud*, which is,[p] *the Church of God*, the ſame Church being reckoned[q] *a ſpeciall kind of vniuerſality, as it were a whole world redeemed or deliuered out of the whole world*; and that there is *a world* of which Chriſt ſaith,[r] *I am not of the world*, and[s] *I pray not for the world*, which therefore he cannot be vnderſtood to loue: and according to this difference, the Church of Smyrna writeth that[t] *Chriſt ſuffered for the ſaluation of the whole world of them that are to be ſaued*. Properly therefore to ſpeake of the intendment of Chriſts death, he died not generally for all, but onely for them that were to be ſaued thereby. Therefore *S. Auſtine* hauing mentioned the words of the Apoſtle,[u] *Who ſpared not his owne Sonne, but gaue him for vs al*, asketh the queſtion, *But which vs? Euen vs*, ſaith he, *whom he hath foreknowne, predeſtinated, iuſtified, glorified, of whom it followeth, Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect?* So *S. Ambroſe*,[x] *Though Chriſt died for all, yet ſpecially he ſuffered for vs, becauſe he ſuffered for his Church*. For *the elect* then Chriſt hath died in peculiar and ſpeciall wiſe, to giue vnto them the benefit that ſhould ariſe of his death: for them only he hath giuen himſelf in loue, with purpoſe to make them partakers of his loue. And in this meaning it is, that the Apoſtle ſaith, *Chriſt hath loued me, and giuen himſelfe for me*, which becauſe it is the voice of faith, it followeth that by faith we haue particular application of Chriſts loue towards our ſelues, and doe beleeue, that hauing *giuen himſelf for vs*, and being *giuen vnto vs*, he is wholy ours; the merit and righteouſneſſe that he hath performed in giuing himſelfe to liue and to die for

g Mat. 20. 28. & 26. 28.
h *Hieron. in Mat.* 26. *Non dixit pro omnibus, ſed pro multis, id eſt, pro his qui credere voluerunt.*
i Act. 13. 48.
k Ioh. 13. 1.
l Cap. 17. 9.
m Verſ. 6
n Cap. 3. 16.
o *Auguſt. in* 1. *Ioan. tract.* 2. *Propitiatio peccatorum totius mundi quem ſuo ſanguine comparauit.*
p Act. 20. 28.
q *Proſp. de voc. Gent. lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. *Populus Dei ſpecialis quædã cenſetur vniuerſitas, vt de toto mundo totus mundus liberatus, & de omnibus hominibus omnes homines videantur aſſumpti.*
r Ioh. 8. 23.
s Cap. 17. 9.
t *Euſeb. hiſt. eccl. lib.* 4. *cap.* 15. *Pro totius ſeruandorum mundi ſalute paſſus eſt.*
u Rom. 8. 32.
x *Aug. in Ioan. trac.* 45. *Sed quibus nobis? Præſcitis, prædeſtinatis, iuſtificatis, glorificatis, de quibus ſequitur, Quis accuſabit &c.*
y *Ambro. in Luc.* c. 7. *Etſi Chriſtus pro omnibus paſſus eſt, pro nobis tamen ſicut aliter paſſus eſt, quia pro Eccleſia paſſus eſt.*

for vs, is ours, to the forgiueneſſe of our ſins and euerlaſting life. Now then euery true beleeuing man hath by the Goſpell this boldneſſe miniſtred vnto him, to make application to himſelfe of the death of Chriſt, & the benefit therof; and yet it followeth not that Turkes, Iewes, heretikes, leaud Catholikes may make bold with Chriſt in that behalfe, becauſe they haue not faith whereby to conceiue this boldneſſe; and wee cannot but wonder, that ſo drunken a concluſion ſhould proceed from him that carrieth the name and reputation of a learned man. *They muſt firſt*, ſaith he, *doe thoſe things which he requireth at their hands, to be made partakers of his ineſtimable merits, as to repent heartily of their ſins, to beleeue and hope in him. Firſt*, ſaith he, they muſt doe theſe things, but hauing ſo done, may they then apply vnto themſelues the merit & righteouſneſſe of Chriſt? If ſo, then he ſaith nothing againſt vs, who teach no faith to ſaluation, but according to the rule of Chriſt; [z] *Repent and beleeue the Goſpell*; no remiſſion of ſins, but according to the like rule, that [a] *repentance and remiſſion of ſins are preached in the name of Chriſt*; and againe, [b] *Repent and be baptized euery one of you in the name of Ieſus Chriſt for the remiſſion of ſins*. We ſay with *Auſtine*, [c] *No man runneth to the forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, but hee that is diſpleaſing to himſelfe*: and againe, [d] *No man entreth into the bodie of the Church, except he be firſt ſlaine; he dieth as touching that hee was, that hee may bee that that hee was not.* Now if hauing done theſe things, he may not yet apply vnto himſelfe the righteouſnes and merit of Chriſt, then *M. Biſhop* doth but trifle and mock his Reader, in ſaying, *firſt* he muſt doe theſe things. And yet how doth he ſay that a man thus doing, *is made partaker of Chriſts ineſtimable merits*, if he may not apply the ſame vnto himſelfe? Mary, ſaith he, *we are not aſſured that we ſhall performe all this; therfore we may not ſo preſumptuouſly apply vnto our ſelues Chriſts righteouſnes*. But what if we know that we haue done all this, may we then applie vnto our ſelues Chriſts righteouſnes? His meaning is, that we may not, becauſe, as we haue heard, he denieth wholly the imputation of the righteouſnes of Chriſt; & therfore doth but ſpend his wit in aſſigning the cauſe why we may not apply the ſame, to be becauſe we are not aſſured of doing the things mentioned by him. But if he be not aſſured of his repentance, faith, hope, &c. no maruel if he faile of all other aſſurance towards God; yet let him not bee like the dogge

[z] Mar. 1. 15.

[a] Luke 24. 47.
[b] Acts 2. 38.

[c] *Auguſt. in Pſal. 41. Nemo currit ad remiſſionem peccatorum niſi qui diſplicet ſibi.*
[d] *Idem in Pſal. 123. In eccleſia corpus nemo intrat niſi priùs occiſus: meritur quod fuit vt ſit quod non fuit.*

dogge in the manger: if he can make no vſe of Chriſt himſelfe, let him not be ſnarling and biting at them that doe. As for the places alleged by *M. Perkins*, to ſhew that *Paul* is vnto vs an example of beleeuing, the former of them is plaine: [c] *Brethren be followers of mee, and looke on them that walke ſo as ye haue vs for an enſample.* If in the faith and doctrine of Chriſt wee be to follow *Paul*, then by our faith we are to beleeue of our ſelues as he beleeued of himſelfe, and what he wrote in that behalfe, we are to take it as written for our learning, not as a matter particular and peculiar to himſelfe. The other place is moſt notable, where *Paul* firſt propoundeth it as [f] *a true ſaying, and worthy by all meanes to be receiued, that Ieſus Chriſt came into the world to ſaue ſinners.* He addeth, *Of whom I am chiefe*, that is, of which ſinners whom Chriſt would ſaue I was a chiefe, I was the formoſt man, [g] *not in time but in badneſſe*, as *S. Auſtine* expoundeth it. *Notwithſtanding for this cauſe I was receiued to mercie*, ſaith he, *that Ieſus Chriſt ſhould ſhew on mee being the chiefe, all long ſuffering, to the enſample of them that ſhould in time to come beleeue in him vnto eternall life.* Now how doth the place import, that *Paul* ſhould be an enſample to them that beleeue in Chriſt, but that all that beleeue in Chriſt, may learne in him not to be diſmaied at the greatneſſe and grieuouſneſſe of their ſinnes, whereof they haue ſeene the like in him, but with him to receiue that *true ſaying*, that *Chriſt came into the world to ſaue ſinners*, and therefore reſolue that hee would ſaue them as hee had ſaued him, that they ſhould not feare to ſay euen as he could ſay, *Chriſt hath loued me, and giuen himſelfe for me.* [h] *Hee confeſſeth himſelfe ſuch a ſinner*, ſaith Auſtine, *as that therefore no ſinner may deſpaire of himſelfe, becauſe* Paul *obtained pardon.* It was not therefore the *vnskilfulneſſe of a ſectarie*, but true diuinitie that made *M. Perkins* to make that vſe and application of the Apoſtles words, but it was *M. Biſhops* abſurditie, to ſay that the place importeth onely, that *Paul* was made an *example of patience*, without expreſſing how or what *patience* he meaneth, there being no patience there ſpoken of, but the *patience* of Chriſt, bearing with men long in great and fearefull ſinnes, and yet at length of his owne mercy calling them to be partakers of his ſaluation.

c Phil. 3. 17.

f 1. Tim. 1. 15.

g *Aug. in Pſal.* 70. *Primus non tempore, ſed vnaſcitate.*

h *Aug. de Temp. ſer.* 49. *Talem ſe peccatorem confitetur fuiſſe, vt omnis peccator propterea de ſe non deſperet, quia Paulus meruit indulgentiam.*

16. W.

16. W. BISHOP.

*M. Perkins 2. Reaſon.* That which we muſt aske of God in praier, that we muſt beleeue ſhall be giuen vs: but in praier wee muſt aske the merits of Chriſts righteouſneſſe to our ſelues. *Ergo.*

Anſwer. *Of the* Maior *much hath been ſaid before: here I admit it, all due circumſtances of praier being obſerued, & deny that we muſt pray, that our Sauiour Chriſt Ieſus merits may be made ours in particular, for that were greatly to abaſe them: but good Chriſtians pray, that through the infinite value of thoſe his merits, our ſins may be forgiuen, and a iuſtice proportionable vnto our capacitie, may be powred into our ſoules, whereby we may lead a vertuous life, and make a bleſſed end. But it is goodly to behold, how* M. Perkins *proueth that wee muſt pray, that Chriſts righteouſneſſe may be made our particular iuſtice, becauſe, ſaith he,* We are taught in the *Pater noſter*, to pray in this manner: *Forgiue vs our debts*, & to this we muſt ſay *Amen*, which is as much to ſay, as our petition is granted. *I thinke the poore mans wits were gone a pilgrimage when he wrote thus. Good Sir, cannot our ſinnes or debts be forgiuen, without we apply Chriſts righteouſneſſe to vs in particular? We ſay yes. Do not then ſo ſimply beg that which is in queſtion, nor take that for gruen, which will neuer be granted. But a word with you by the way. Your righteous man muſt ouer-skip that petition of the* Paternoſter (forgiue vs our debts) *for he is well aſſured, that his debts be alreadie pardoned. For at the very firſt inſtant that he had faith, hee had Chriſts righteouſneſſe applied to him, and thereby aſſurance both of the pardon of ſins, and of life euerlaſting. Wherefore he cannot without infidelitie, diſtruſt of his former iuſtification, or pray for remiſſion of his debts: but following the famous example of that formall Phariſee, in lieu of demanding pardon, may well ſay,* O God I giue thee thanks,
Luk. 18. that I am not as the reſt of men, extortioners, vniuſt, aduouterers, as alſo theſe Papiſts: *fearing the remiſſion of my ſins, or the certaintie of my ſaluation, but am well aſſured thereof, and of Chriſts owne righteouſnes too, and ſo forth. But to go on with* M. Perkins *diſcourſe.* Here we muſt note, that the Church of *Rome* cutteth off one principall duty of faith; for in faith *(ſaith M. Perkins)* are two things: firſt, knowledge reuealed in the word, touching the means of ſaluation: ſecondly, an applying of things knowne vnto our ſelues, which

which ſome call affiance: the firſt they acknowledge. *So then by* M. Perkins *owne confeſſion, Catholikes haue true knowledge of the meanes of ſaluation; (then he and his fellowes are miſerable.)* The ſecond which is the ſubſtance and principall they deny.

Anſwer. *Catholikes teach men alſo to haue a firme hope, & a great confidence of obtaining ſaluation, through the mercy of God, & merits of Chriſts Paſſion, ſo they performe their duty towards God, and their neighbor, or elſe die with true repentance. But for a man at his firſt conuerſion, to aſſure himſelfe by faith of Chriſts righteouſneſſe, and life euerlaſting, without condition of doing thoſe things he ought to do, that we Catholikes affirme to be, not any gift of faith, but the haynous crime of preſumption, which is a ſinne againſt the holy Ghoſt, not pardonable, neither in this life, nor in the world to come.* See S. Th. 2.2. q. 21. art. 1.

## R. Abbot.

The *Maior* propoſition he graunteth, yet with this limitation; *all due circumſtances of praier being obſerued.* But his circumſtances as he intendeth them, are but a Labyrinth to intricate and perplexe the conſciences of men, and to bereaue them of all ioy and comfort of their praiers. We beleeue that [a] *God is nigh vnto all them that call vpon him in truth.* Wee know that many are the weakeneſſes and imperfections of our praiers, many our diſtractions in that deuotion, but yet we beleeue that God reſpecting the truth, and not the meaſure of our hearts, pardoneth the ſame for Chriſts ſake, who is our high Prieſt, [b] *to beare the iniquity of our holy offerings, to make them acceptable before the Lord.* To the *Minor* propoſition he anſwereth, that *we muſt not pray that Chriſts merits may bee made ours in particular, for that were greatly to abaſe them.* As though the Prophet *Dauid* did abaſe God in making him his in particular ſaying, [c] *The Lord is my rocke and my fortreſſe, my God and my ſtrength, my ſhield, the horne of my ſaluation, and my refuge,* with infinite other ſpeeches of the like ſort. As though *Thomas* did abaſe our Sauiour Chriſt in calling him, [d] *My Lord and my God.* We do no iniurie to God to make him ours in particular, becauſe he hath ſaid, as to *Abraham*, ſo to euery one of the ſeede of *Abraham*, [e] *I will be thy God.* We do no iniurie to men, becauſe wee do not thereby make him our peculiar, but leaue him the ſame to others, that hee is to vs as

a Pſal. 145. 18.

b Exod 28. 38.

c Pſal. 18. 2.

d Iohn 20. 28.

e Gen. 17. 7.

euery

euery man enioieth the light of the Sunne to his owne vse, without impeachment thereof to the vse of any other man. [f] *Let God*, saith Austine, *be our possession, our inheritance. What, do we vnaduisedly in making God a possession to our selues, he being our Lord & Creator? It is no rashnesse or vnaduisednesse; it is affection of desire, it is sweetnes of hope. Let the soule boldly say, Thou art my God, to him that saith to our soule, I am thy saluation. It shall do no wrong in saying so; nay it shal do wrong in not saying so.* And thus *S. Bernard* saith, that [g] *the soule that looketh vpon God, doth no otherwise looke vpon him, then as if it selfe only were looked vpon of God.* For [h] *this is the property of loue*, as Chrysostom saith, *to make proper to a mans selfe that that is common*; which he speaketh by occasiō of the Apostles words hādled in the former section, *Christ hath loued me, &c.* where hee saith, that the Apostle [i] *vpō his loue to Christ, doth make proper to himself that that was done for all.* Accordingly *S. Austine* saith, [k] *I speake more safely & more sweetly to my Iesus then to any of the holy Spirits or Angels of God.* Now do all these speeches tend to the abasing of God, and of his Sonne Iesus Christ? Did *S. Austine*, or whosoeuer was the Author of those words, abase Christ in naming him *my Iesus?* If not, what abasing then is it of the merits of Christ, that we should make them particularly ours? But to shew him his folly, *S. Bernard* saith that [l] *but that Cain was not of the members of Christ, nor had any thing to do with the merit of Christ; to presume the same to be his, he wold haue called that his that was Christs, as the member doth that that is the heads*, plainely giuing to vnderstand, that the faithfull man being a member of Christ, doth cal that his that is Christs, & presumeth the merit of Christ to be particularly his. And therefore he saith in the next words, [m] *Whatsoeuer is wanting vnto me of my self, I holdly take it vnto me out of the bowels of the Lord Iesus, because they runne out with mercy.* What should let then but that we may pray that the merits of Christ may be made particularly ours, and accepted as particularly a satisfaction for vs to the forgiuenesse of our sinnes? Nay, saith *M. Bishop*, good *Christians pray that through the infinit value of Christs merits our sinnes may be forgiuen vs, &c.* But I pray, *M. Bishop*, how do you thinke your sinnes particularly forgiuen, but by the particular application of his merits, his passion, death, and resurrection, and his sitting at the right hand of God, to make in-

tercess-

f *Aug. in Psal. 32 conc. 2. Ipse sit hereditas nostra, possessio nostra. An fortè temerè dicimus faciendo nobis Deū possessionem cùm sit Dominus, cùm sit Creator? Non est ista temeritas; affectus est desiderij & dulcedo spei. Dicat anima, omnino securа ducat; Deus meus es tu, qui dicit animæ nostræ, salus tua ego sum. Non faciet iniuriā cùm hoc dixerit, immò faciet si non dixerit.*

g *Bernard in Cān. ser. 69. Anima Deum videns haud secus videt quàm si sola videatur à Deo.*

h *Chrysost. in Gene. hom. 34. Peculiare hoc est amoris vt ex cōmunibus propria faciat.*

i *Ibid. Propter amorem in eum id quod factum est omnibus mihi proprium facio.*

k *August. de visit. infirm. lib. 2. cap. 2. Tutius et iucundius loquor ad meum Iesum quàm ad aliquem sanctorum spirituum Dei.*

l *Bern. in Cant. ser. 61. Nisi quod non erat de membris Christi nec pertinebat ad eū de Christi merito vt sibi presumeret, suum diceret quod illius esset, tanquā rem capitis membrum.*

m *Ibid. Ego fideliter quod ex me mihi deest vsurpo mihi ex visceribus Domini, quoniam misericordia effluunt.*

tercession for vs? Can a medicine worke without beeing applied particularly to him in whom it is to work? How do you pray that *a iustice proportionable to your capacity*, as you very nicely and gingerly describe it, may be giuen particularly to you for Christs sake, that is, as we take it, in regard of that that Christ hath done, as generally for others, so particularly for you, but that you take it, that Christ hath done the same particularly for you, as wel as for other particulars? And but that your wits outrunne you, and leaue you to say you know not what, what is this but to apply the merits of Christ particularly to your selfe? Otherwise it may be said vnto you, what haue you to doe particularly with Christ, that for his sake you aske any thing particularly for your selfe? Surely wee cannot aske any thing of God for Christs sake, but by supposing a particular relation betwixt Christ and vs, depending vpon that that he hath done and merited for vs. But Maister *Perkins* to shew that in our praier, we aske the merit of Christs righteousnesse to our selues, alledgeth the petition of the Lords praier, *Forgiue vs our trespasses*. For what is forgiuenesse of sinnes, but a thing merited by the righteousnesse & obedience of Christ? Our Sauiour saith in the Gospel, that [n] *his blond is shed for the forgiuenesse of sinnes*. When then wee begge forgiuenesse of sinnes, what do we but begge to our selues the fruit of the bloudshedding of Iesus Christ? The righteousnesse of Christ containeth the whole obedience that Christ performed to his Father, both in liuing & dying, to be the satisfaction for our sinnes. And if there be no forgiuenesse of sinnes, but onely by his satisfaction for vs, what do we when we craue forgiuenesse of sinnes, but craue the application of Christs righteousnesse vnto vs, that it may bee accepted for our satisfaction to the forgiuenesse of our sinnes? Now to our praier *M. Perkins* noteth, that we adde *Amen*, as a word of confirmation vnto vs, that God heareth our petition, and graunteth the same according to the promise that hee hath made vnto vs. Which hee saide not onely of himselfe, but alledged to that purpose the saying of *Austine*, affirming, that [o] *Amen in these petitions signifieth, that that which is craued of the Lord, is vndoubtedly graunted, if wee stedfastly hold fast the couenant of our last condition or creation*, which is our faith in Christ Iesus. Now if Maister *Bishops* wits had beene at home, hee would not haue thought Maister *Perkins* wits to be *gone a pilgrimage* for the

n Mat. 26. 28.

o *Auguſt. de Temp. ſer.* 182. *Amen in his petitionibus ſignificat indubitanter & Domino conferri quod petitur, ſi vltimæ conditionis pactum firmiter teneatur.*

writing of these things, neither would he haue conceiued that he had begged the thing in question, but rather proued it, vnlesse hee will say, that there can bee forgiuenesse of sinnes without the satisfaction and merit of Christ, which what is it to vs, but by being particularly applied vnto vs, and accepted to our vse? As for *our righteous man*, as he calleth him, he hath no warrant to omit to pray for the forgiuenesse of his sinnes, because he is no otherwise taught to beleeue it, but as he praieth for it. But in praying for it, he hath assurance from Christ to beleeue the obtaining of it, who saith, p *What soeuer ye desire when ye pray, beleeue that ye shall haue it, and it shall bee done vnto you.* Of this sufficient hath beene said before in the question of q *the Certaintie of Salvation*, and I list not here to follow him in an idle and impertinent vagarie. Onely I maruell that his head should goe so farre awry, as to apply to vs the example of the Pharisee, being so farre different from vs. For the Pharisee was outright a Papist, auouching inherent iustice, and presuming thereof in himselfe, although by the gift of God euen as the Papists doe. Nay, Maister *Bishops* righteous man goeth beyond the Pharisee, saying, I thanke thee, O God, that I am iust r *before thee, cleane and whiter then snow, no more sinne left in me then was in Adam in the state of innocency*, and therefore s *worthy of thy kingdome and of the ioyes of heauen*, t *not needing greatly to feare the rigorous sentence of a iust iudge*; and if I do not certainly know it, yet u *I hope that I am so*; and not like these Protestants, whose x *righteous man is like vnto sepulchers whited on the outside with an imputed iustice, but within full of iniquity and disorder.* Let him heere take knowledge of his descriptiõ of their righteous man out of his own words, & thereby know himselfe to be some degrees aboue the absurdity of the Pharisee. But the righteous man whom we teach, is such, as the auncient Fathers many times describe out of the words of *Solomon*, as they did reade them: y *The iust man in the beginning of his speech is an accuser of himselfe.* When hee cõmeth into the presence of God, he beginneth his speech with acknowledging his owne vnworthinesse, & sinne. His righteousnesse he knoweth to be such, as leaueth him still to say with *Dauid*, z *Enter not into iudgement with thy seruãt, O Lord; for in thy sight no mã liuing shal be found righteous.* a *He falleth seuen times a day*, and daily praieth for forgiuenes, and so continueth till God manifest the effect of his praier, beeing

p Mar.11.24.

q Sect.5.& 18.

r Cha.2. sect.10.
s Cha.4.sect.2.

t Ibid.sect.4.

u Cha.3.sect.3. & 14
x Cha.4.sect. 2.

y Prou.18.17. *Iustus in principio sermonis accusator est sui. Hieron cont.Pelag. lib.1.*

z Psal.143.2.

a Prou.24.16. *Vulgar.*

well

well aſſured in the meane time vpon the promiſe of God, that God heareth him, and will make it appeare that he hath not praied in vain. But to let this go, *M. Biſhop* taketh it for an aduãtage to him, that *M. Perkins* cõfeſſeth, that *the Church of Rome acknowledgeth a knowledge reuealed in the word touching the meanes of ſaluation.* But what doth it aduantage him, that the Church of Rome hath that which the diuels haue? They know that the means of ſaluation is by Chriſt crucified, dying, riſing again from the dead, by faith, by the ſacramẽts, but they haue not the vſe of this knowledge, wherin conſiſteth the life therof. No more hath the Church of Rome, which profeſſing generally the meanes of ſaluation to bee in the croſſe, & death, & reſurrection of Chriſt, in faith, and in the ſacraments, doth in the ſpecial vſe & application therof, wholly ouerthrow all, fruſtrateth the croſſe, & death, & reſurrection of Chriſt, peruerteth the faith, corrupteth the ſacraments, blendeth & mingleth the Goſpel with her own traditions, deuiſeth other meanes of ſaluation, & wickedly maketh the people to truſt therein. Now if it follow that we erre miſerably, as he ſaith, becauſe they do thus know the means of ſaluation reuealed in the word, it muſt follow that they alſo erre miſerably, becauſe all other heretiks know the means of ſaluation in that ſort as wel as they. And indeed they do erre miſerably, who go from the word, as touching the vſe and effect of that means of ſaluation which they learn from thence, and cõtrary to the word, tie the ſame to other ſupplemẽts, which they thẽſelues haue borowed of human deuice. Now the *firme hope and great cõfidence*, wherof he anſwereth to the 2. point mentioned by *M. Perkins*, is a meere colluſion. He maketh it *firme* on Gods behalf, but on our ſide moſt infirm & vncertain, becauſe by his rules a man cãnot tell whether he haue any true repentance, or faith, or hope, or charity, or any thing elſe wherupon his hope ſhould ſtãd, which he ſtil hãgeth vpon mans worthines & diſpoſition of himſelf; & leaueth it in the power & choice of his own *free wil*. But true faith beleeueth [b] *the promiſe of God to be firme and ſure, not vpon our merits, but vpon his own mercy*, & accordingly embraceth the ſame, not with an vncertain cõditiõ if we do this or that, but with ful aſſurance that God [c] according to his promiſe wil keep vs in his feare, to do that which we ought to do, & when by frailty we fall, will in mercy looke vpon vs as he did vpon [d] *Peter*, & wil cauſe vs to riſe

[b] *Aug. in Pſal. 88. Non ſecundum merita noſtra, ſed ſecundum illius miſericordiam firma eſt promiſſio*

[c] Ierem. 32. 40.

[d] Luk. 22. 61.

againe. And this hope and aſſurance God offereth vnto vs, euen from our firſt conuerſion for Chriſts ſake, and thenceforth we accordingly expect euerlaſting life, not for our owne ſakes, but [e] *in Chriſt*, by vertue of his righteouſnes, obedience, and merit, and of the purchaſe that he hath made in our behalfe. Neither is this any vnlawful preſumption, but [f] *a good preſumption*, as *S. Ambroſe* ſpeaketh, and that [g] *becauſe*, as *S. Auſtine* ſaith, *wee preſume not vpon our owne vertue or power, but vpon the grace of God.* As for his charging of vs in reſpect heereof with *ſinne againſt the holy Ghoſt*, it is but a ſcape of his ignorance, who as it ſeemeth, vnderſtandeth not what is meant thereby. What his ſchoolemen haue written therof, it is nothing to vs, but let him learne by *Hierome* how to vnderſtand it out of the text it ſelfe. [h] *He*, ſaith hee, *who vnderſtanding manifeſtly the works of God, when he cannot gaineſay as touching the power, doth yet of enuie calumniate the ſame, and affirmeth Chriſt, and the word of God, and the workes of the holy Ghoſt to be of the diuell, to him it ſhall not be forgiuen, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.* This is a dreadfull ſinne, and let *M. Biſhop* take heede, the light of God ſo cleerely ſhining as that it cannot but dazle his eies, that he doe not intangle himſelfe in the guilt thereof, by wilfull oppoſition againſt the truth.

e 1. Ioh. 5. 11.

f *Ambroſ. de ſacram. lib. 5. cap. 4. Præſume non de operatione tua, ſed de Chriſti gratia. Bona præſumptio.*

g *Auguſt. de verb. Dom. ſer. 7. Gratia mea plenas es, quia nõ de virtute tua, ſed de gratia mea præſumpſiſti.*

h *Hieron. in Mat. ca. 12. Qui manifeſtè intelligens opera Dei, cùm ac virtute negare non poſſit, eadem ſtimulatus inuidia calumniatur, & Chriſtum, Deique verbum, & opera Sp. ſancti dicet eſſe Beelzebub: iſti non dimittetur neque in præſenti ſeculo, nec in futuro.*

## 17. W. Biſhop.

Maſter Perkins *third reaſon is drawne from the conſent of the ancient Church, of which for faſhion ſake to make ſome ſhew, hee often ſpeaketh, but can ſeldome finde any one ſentence in them that fits his purpoſe, as you may ſee in this ſentence of* Saint Auguſtine, *cited by him.* Auguſtine *ſaith*, I demand now, doeſt thou beleeue in Chriſt, O ſinner? thou ſaieſt, I beleeue: what, beleeueſt thou that all thy ſinnes may freely be pardoned by him? thou haſt that which thou beleeueſt. *See, here is neither applying of Chriſts righteouſnes vnto vs by faith, nor ſo much as beleeuing our ſins to be pardoned through him, but that they may be pardoned by him. So there is not one word for* M. Perkins. *But* S. Bernard *ſaith plainly*, that we muſt beleeue that our ſins are pardoned vs. *But he addeth not by the imputed righteouſnes of Chriſt. Againe, he addeth conditions on our party, which* M. Perkins *craftily concealeth. For* Saint Bernard *grameth, that we may beleeue our*

*De verbis Domini. ſer. 7.*

*our sinnes to be forgiuen, of the truth of our conuersion meete with the mercy of God preuenting vs, for in the same place he hath these words:* So therefore shall his mercy dwell in our earth, *that is* the grace of God in our soules, if mercy and truth meet together, if iustice and peace embrace and kisse each other. *Which is as* S. Bernard *there expoundeth it, if we stirred vp by the grace of God, do truly bewaile our sins and confesse them, and afterward follow holinesse of life and peace. All which* M Perkins *did wisely cut off, because it dasbed cleane the vaine glosse of the former words.*

*His last authority is out of* S. Cyprian, *who exhorteth men, passing out of this life, not to doubt of Gods promises, but to beleeue that we shall come to Christ with ioyfull security.*

Answer. S. Cyprian *encourageth good Christians dying to haue a full confidence in the promises of Christ, and so do all Catholikes, and bid them be secure too on that side, that Christ will neuer faile of his word & promise, but say that the cause of feare lies on our owne infirmities: And yet buds them not to doubt, as though they were as likely to bee condemned as saued, but animates them, and puts them in the good way of hope, by twenty kinds of reason.*

## R. Abbot.

The drift of Saint *Austine* in the place alledged, is to shew, that we are [a] *to presume of God onely, not of our selues, and to attribute all that we are* (towards him) *wholy to his grace. If thou presume of thine owne worke, then is it a wages paied, not a grace giuen vnto thee. But if it be grace, then it is freely giuen.* Hereupō follow the words alledged: [b] *I demaund now, O sinner, doest thou beleeue Christ? Thou saiest, I beleeue. What dost thou beleeue? That all thy sinnes may be pardoned freely by him?* By which words he would import, that the sinner is to beleeue, that in Christ onely there is enough to yeeld him forgiuenesse of sinnes, and therefore that hee is to presume onely vpon him. Which if he do, Saint *Austine* telleth him, *Thou hast that which thou beleeuest*, and addeth, *O grace freely giuen.* Now *M. Bishop* should here haue told vs, what it is that S. *Austine* telleth the beleeuing sinner that *he hath*: what that *grace* is that he saith is here *freely giuen* vnto him. For if it be *forgiuenes of sinne*, as indeed it is, then the words import, that the sinner beleeuing in Christ for the for-

[a] *Aug. de verb. Dom. ser. 7. Elegi de me præsumentes, non de se. Tolli gratia semper reputa. Si de tuo opere præsumis ergo merces tibi redditur, non gratia. condemnatur. Si autē gratis est, gratis datur.*

[b] *Interrogo nunc, Credis ô peccator, Christū? Dicis, Credo. Quid credis? Gratis omnium peccata tibi per ipsum posse remitti? Habes quod credidisti. O gratia gratis data.*

*forgiuenesse of sinnes*, and relying wholy vpon him, assuredly hath that for which he beleeueth, and therefore is not to doubt thereof. And herein he alludeth to that in the Gospell, where Christ asketh the blind men; *Beleeue ye that I am able to doe this*, to draw frō thē, whether they did attribute so much to him, as to expect so great a benefit from him. When therefore they answered, *Yea, Lord, be touched their eies, saying; According to your faith so be it vnto you.* So with *S. Austine* the word *may* serueth to chalenge a sufficiency to Iesus Christ, and to exclude other meanes of forgiuenesse of sinnes, not to question the beleefe of the forgiuenesse thereof, which hee so resolutely affirmeth to him that beleeueth, and can be no otherwise but by the applying of the righteousnesse, the merit, the satisfaction of Christ, because we cannot beleeue it but onely thereby. The place of *Bernard* is very impudētly shiftedoff. First, by altering the question, which is not here, by what wee beleeue our sins to be forgiuen, but whether it be the property of a iustifying faith, to beleeue particularly the forgiuenes of a mans own sinnes. Now *S. Bernard* saith, that [d] *for a man to beleeue that he cannot haue forgiuenesse of sinnes, but by Gods pardon*, is but *the beginning & foundation of faith. Therefore*, saith he, *if thou beleeue that thy sinnes cannot be done away but by him to whom onely thou hast sinned, thou doest well;* [e] *but go further yet, to beleeue that by him thy sins are forgiuen thee. This is*, saith he, *the testimony that the holy Ghost giueth in our heart, saying, Thy sinnes are forgiuen thee. For thou doth the Apostle suppose that a man is iustified freely by faith.* Of imputed righteousnesse enough hath bene said before: the point here is of particular faith, whether a mā beleeue his owne sinnes to be forgiuen him. *S. Bernard* saith yea, and saith it so plainely, as that *M. Bishop* could not tell for his life what directly to answer to it. But forsooth *S. Bernard addeth conditions on our party, saith he, which* M. Perkins *craftily concealeth*, and here he bringeth words following a mile after, where *S. Bernard* hath broken off the point formerly in hand, which was to set forth the condition of a true iustifying & sauing faith. And what I pray are the conditions that he addeth? *Forsooth truth of confession, bewailing of our sinnes and confessing them, and afterwards following holines and peace.* Where we see a glosing sycophant, which will make the simple Reader beleeue, that he giueth an answer when indeede he giueth none. For when we teach the beleefe of the forgiuenesse

c Mat. 9. 28.

d *Bernard in Annunciat. ser. 3. Initium quoddam & velut fundamentum fidei.*

e *Sed adde adhuc vt & hoc credas quia per ipsum tibi peccata donātur Hoc est testimonium quod perhibet in corde nostro Sp. sanctus, dicens Dimittuntur tibi peccata tua. Sic enim arbitratur Apostolus grātis iustificari hominē per fidem.*

of

of ſinnes, do we teach a man vnconuerted to beleeue the ſame? The penitent ſinner confeſſing and bewailing his ſinnes to God, and carefull as hauing felt the ſting of ſinne, thenceforth to auoid the ſame, is the proper and onely true ſubiect of this diſputation of iuſtification by faith. We denie that faith hath place in any other man, and therefore denie that any other can haue the true beleefe of the forgiueneſſe of his ſinnes. Of the conuerted man then, of him that truely repenteth and forſaketh his ſinnes, *S. Bernard* ſaith, and we ſay, that the faith whereby he is iuſtified, is a faith whereby he particularly beleeueth the forgiueneſſe of his owne ſinnes. What is *M. Biſhop* now but a wrangling Sophiſter, that thus in a miſt of idle diſcourſe, ſeeketh to ſteale away, where in deede he is ſo faſt holden that he cannot vntie himſelfe? In like ſort he dealeth with the other place of *Cyprian*, who encoraging faithfull Chriſtians againſt the terrour and feare of death, ſaith; [f] *God hath promiſed immortality vnto thee, when thou departeſt out of this world, and doſt thou wauer and doubt thereof? This is not to know God, this is by the ſinne of vnbeliefe, to offend Chriſt the maiſter of beleeuers; this is for a man being in the Church, to be without faith in the houſe of faith.* The words are manifeſt. Hee propoundeth the promiſe of God particularly: requireth the ſame accordingly to be beleeued; not to beleeue it ſo, he affirmeth is to be *without faith in the houſe of faith.* God promiſeth *to thee*, and doſt thou doubt? this is not to haue faith. *Cyprian* then teacheth ſuch a confidence in the promiſes of Chriſt, as is to bee without all wauering or doubt. Yea ſaith *M. Biſhop, we are ſecure on Chriſtes ſide, that he will neuer faile of his word and promiſe, but the cauſe of feare lies vpon our owne infirmities.* Thus he is like the mother that ſtrangleth her child ſo ſoone as ſhe hath brought it forth. He ſetteth vp *confidence* with one hand, and throweth it downe with another; nay, he ſetteth it vp with one hand, and throweth it downe with both. What is it to vs, that Chriſt is true of his word, if we may not beleeue that his word doth appertaine to vs? what confidence can it yeeld, that Chriſt faileth not of his promiſe, ſo long as wee muſt feare leſt our infirmities diſable vs of hauing any part therein? And would *Cyprian* talke ſo idlely, to bid men not wauer or doubt, when they might anſwer they had cauſe to feare and doubt, by reaſon of their owne infirmities? Would he bid men not doubt to go out of the world, becauſe of

[f] *Cyprian. de Mortal.* Deus tibi de hoc mundo recidenti immortalitatem pollicetur, & tu dubitas & fluctuas? Hoc eſt, Deũ omninò non noſſe: hoc eſt, Chriſtum credentium magiſtrum peccato incredulitatis offendere: hoc eſt, in eccleſia conſtitutum fidem in domo fidei non habere.

the promiſe of God, when their owne infirmities might be a ſufficient cauſe to make them feare their departure out of this world? But *Cyprian* knew well that wee can haue nothing but feare from our ſelues, and therefore teacheth vs to build our ſelues wholly vpon the promiſe of God, that howſoeuer our own infirmities do offer vs occaſion of diſtruſt, yet reſting vpon the truth of God,

g Rom. 4. 18. we beleeue with *Abraham*[g] *vnder hope againſt hope*, that God will performe what he hath ſpoken, for his owne ſake, as he ſaith by the

h Ezech. 36. 22. Prophet, [h] *Not for your ſakes, but for my holy names ſake I will doe it, ſaith the Lord.* Yea, but *wee bidde them not doubt*, ſaith Maſter Biſhop, *as if they were as likely to be condemned as ſaued.* But how ſo, when they ſee and know in themſelues that for which they may be condemned, and cannot know any thing whereupon they may reſt the hope of ſaluation? For you ſay, Maſter *Biſhop*, that a man cannot tell whether hee haue repentance, hope, charitie, praier, whether he be iuſtified, and in the ſtate of grace or not, and therfore how ſhould he but thinke himſelfe more likely to bee condemned then otherwiſe? You ſay you *animate them, and put them in the good way of hope, by twenty kinds of reaſons.* But how can you put them in hope when you teach them to feare? That one reaſon whereby you impoſe feare, carrieth more ſway in the conſcience, then all thoſe twenty kindes of reaſons, whereby you perſwade hope. And when you teach that a man cannot tell whether he haue any hope or not, what can there reſt but horrour and deſpaire, at leaſtwiſe anguiſh, perplexitie, trembling and feare, ſaue only in conſciences that are benummed and aſtoniſhed, and haue

i *Hilar. in Pſal. 51. Spes noſtra in miſericordia Domini in ſeculum & in ſeculum ſeculi.* no feeling of themſelues? In a word, in death there can bee no hope, but ſetting aſide the reſpect of our ſelues, to depend vpon the promiſe of God, and to ſay with *Hilary* out of the Pſalme, [i] *Our hope is in the mercy of God for euer and euer.*

## 18. W. BISHOP.

M. Perkins *hauing thus confirmed his owne partie, why doth he not after his manner confute thoſe reaſons which the Catholikes allege in fauour of their aſſertion? Was it becauſe they are not wont to produce any in this matter? Nothing leſſe: It was then belike, becauſe he knew not how to anſwer them. I will out of their ſtore take that one princi-*

*paſt*

*all we, of the testimonie of holy Scripture, and by that alone sufficiently proue, that the faith required to Iustification, is that Catholike faith, whereby we beleeue all that to be true, which by God is reuealed, and not any other particular beleeuing Christs Righteousnesse to bee ours. How can this be better knowne, then if we see, weigh, and consider well, what kinde of faith that was which all they had, who are said in Scriptures to be iustified by their faith.*

S. Paul *saith of* Noe, That he was instituted heire of the iustice, *which is, by faith. What faith had hee? That by Christs Righteousnesse he was assured of Saluation? No such matter, but beleeued, that God according to his word and iustice, would drowne the world, and made an Arke to saue himselfe and his familie, as God commanded him.* Heb. 11. 7.

Abraham *the Father of beleeuers, and the paterne and example of iustice by faith, as the Apostle disputeth to the Romans: What faith he was iustified by, let* S. Paul *declare, who of him and his faith hath these words:* Hee contrarie to hope beleeueth in hope, that hee might be made the Father of many Nations, according to that which was said vnto him; So shall thy seede bee as the starres of heauen, and the sands of the sea: and he was not weakned in faith, neither did he consider his owne bodie, now quite dead, whereas hee was almost an hundred yeeres old; nor the dead Matrice of *Sara*, in the promise of God he staggered not by distrust, but was strengthened in faith, giuing glory to God, most fully knowing, that whatsoeuer hee promised, he was able also to doe, therefore was it reputed to him to iustice. *Loe, because he glorified God in beleeuing, that old and barren persons might haue children if God said the word, and that whatsoeuer God promised, he was able to performe, hee was iustified. The Centurions faith was very pleasing vnto our Sauiour, who said in commendation of it,* That he had not found so great faith in Israel. *What faith was that? Marrie, that hee could with a word cure his seruant absent:* Say the word only (*quoth he*) and my seruant shall be healed. Rom. cap. 4. Matth. 8.

S. Peters *faith so much magnified by the ancient Fathers, and highly rewarded by our Sauiour, was it any other,* Then that our Sauiour was Christ, the Sonne of the liuing God? *And briefly let* S. John *that great Secretarie of the holy Ghost, tell vs what faith is the finall end of the whole Gospell.* These things (*saith hee*) are written Matth. 16. John 20.

that

that you may beleeue that Iesus is Christ the Sonne of God, and that beleeuing you may haue life in his name. *With the Euangelist the Apostle* S. Paul *accordeth very well, saying,* This is the word of faith which wee preach, for if thou confesse with thy mouth our Lord Iesus Christ, and shalt beleeue in thy heart that God raised him from death, thou shalt be saued. *And in another place:* I make knowne vnto you the Gospell, which I haue preached, and by which you shall be saued, vnlesse perhaps you haue beleeued in vaine. *What was that Gospell?* I haue deliuered vnto you that which I haue receiued, that Christ died for our sinnes, according to the Scriptures, was buried, and rose againe the third day, &c. *So by the verdict of* S. Paul, *the beleefe of the articles of the Creed, is that iustifying faith, by which you must be saued. And neither in Saint* Paul, *nor any other place of holy Scriptures, is it once taught, that a particular faith, whereby we apply Christs Righteousnesse to our selues, and assure our selues of our saluation, is either a iustifying, or any Christian mans faith, but the very naturall act of that vgly Monster, presumption: which being laid as the very corner stone of the Protestants erreligion, what meer all and modest conuersation, what humility and deuotion can they build vpon it?*

Rom. 10.

1. Cor. 15.

## R. Abbot.

What the reason was why *M. Perkins* here propounded no obiections of the Papists, *M. Bishop* might haue conceiued, because hee had [a] before noted and confuted the best that are alleged by them. If he had not so done, yet it should not be likely that hee had therefore omitted them, because hee knew not how to answer them, because this which *M. Bishop* bringeth for their *principall reason*, is but a very weake and simple reason. The thing that he would proue thereby, is, that iustifying faith is that *Catholike faith*, as he calleth it, *whereby we beleeue all that to be true which God hath reuealed.* Hee abuseth the name of *Catholike faith*, whereby hath been wont to be imported the true and sound doctrine of the Catholike Church, comprised in bookes, taught in Pulpits and schooles, professed by the mouth, which a man may preach to others, and himselfe bee void of iustifying faith. Thus *Vigilius* [b] faith, hauing discoursed of some points of doctrine, *This is the Catholike*

a Chap. 3. Of the Certainty of Saluation.

b *Vigil. cont. Eutych. lib. 1. Hæc est fides & professio Catholica, quam Apostolo's tradiderunt, Martyres roborauerunt, & fideles hucusque custodiunt.*

*Catholike faith and profession which the Apostles deliuered, the Martyrs haue confirmed, and the faithfull keepe vntill this day.* Iustifying faith is the priuate act of the heart and conscience of the man that is iustified, which though it be grounded and buile vpon it, yet cannot but absurdly bee termed the Catholike faith. But *M. Bishop* perhaps by Catholike faith meaneth that iustifying faith, whereby he and his fellow Catholikes must hope to bee iustified. By which meanes he hath matched the diuell with himselfe and his Catholikes, and hath made him a Catholike. For if it bee the only faith of a Catholike to beleeue all that to bee true which God hath reuealed, what hindereth the diuell to bee a Catholike, seeing he beleeueth, and to his greefe well knoweth, that all is true that is reuealed by God? This is that which we rightly call *historicall faith*, the obiect whereof is the word of God in generall, and it is no more but *credere Deo, to beleeue God in that which hee speaketh*, which is incident to diuels and damned men. This *historicall faith* is presupposed and included in *iustifying faith*, but the proper obiect of *iustifying faith* is [c] *God in Christ, reconciling the world vnto himselfe*; or the promise of Gods mercy to vs in Christ Iesus, whereby we doe not onely beleeue the promise in generall to be true, but do trust in God, and expect good at his hands, according to that promise for Christs sake. This faith therefore is called [d] *the faith of Christ*, that is whereby wee beleeue in Christ, and is further expressed to be [e] *faith in his name*, [f] *faith in his bloud*. Of which *S. Austin* saith; [g] *The faith of Christ is to beleeue in him that iustifieth the vngodly; to beleeue in the Mediator, without whose meanes we are not reconciled vnto God; to beleeue in the Sauiour, which came to seeke and to saue that which is lost; to beleeue in him that saith, without me ye can do nothing.* This is the faith whereby wee are saued, and whereby all the faithfull haue been saued from the beginning of the world. To which purpose *S. Austin* againe saith: [h] *The same faith saued the right elders of old that now saueth vs, that is, the faith of the man Iesus Christ the Mediator betwixt God & men, the faith of his bloud, the faith of his crosse, the faith of his death and resurrection.* Thus by faith *Abel* in his lambe beheld [i] *the lambe of God that taketh away the sinnes of the world*, and thereby his sacrifice was accepted, and in that respect is Christ called [k] *the lambe that was slaine from the beginning of the world.* But here *M. Bishop* vnder-

c 2. Cor. 5. 19.
d Rom. 3. 22. Phil. 3. 9.
e Act. 3. 16.
f Rom. 3. 25.
g Aug. in Ioan. tract. 45 *Fides Christi est credere in eum qui iustificat impium: credere in mediatorem sine quo interposito non reconciliamur Deo: credere in saluatorem qui venit quod perierat quærere atque saluare, &c.*
h *August. de nat. & grat. cap. 44. Ea fides iustos saluauit antiquos quæ sanat et nos, id est, mediatoris Dei & hominum hominis Iesu Christi, fides sanguinis eius, fides crucis eius, fides mortis & resurrectionis eius.*
i 1. Ioh. 1. 29.
k Apoc. 13. 8.

vndertaketh to tell vs, and therefore let vs heare of him according to the depth of his diuinity, *what kind of faith that was which all they had who are said in Scriptures to be iustified by their faith.* And first he beginneth with *Noe*, of whom it is sayd, that [l] *he was made heire of the righteousnesse which is by faith.* But what faith was that? *Hee beleeued*, saith hee, *that God according to his word and iustice would drowne the world, and made an Arke to saue himselfe and his familie, as God commanded him.* And what? in the drowning of the world and making of an arke to saue himselfe, did *Noe* consider nothing but the drowning of the world and the making of an arke to saue himselfe? S. *Austin* calleth the *Arke*, [m] *the Sacrament of the Arke*, and in a *sacrament* or mysterie did the *faith* of *Noe* see no more but onely what his eyes did see? [n] *In sacraments*, as *Chrysostome* saith, *we do not see that which we beleeue, but we see one thing and beleeue another.* *Noe* then in the Arke did beleeue that which he did not see, which what it was, S. *Peter* giueth vs to vnderstand, when he maketh our *baptisme* the thing that [o] *answereth the type and figure* of the Arke, which, saith he, *saueth vs by the resurrection of Iesus Christ.* The Arke then was to him a figure and seale of the same, whereof Baptisme is a figure and seale to vs; [p] *a seale of the righteousnesse of faith*, of [q] *the righteousnesse of God by the faith of Iesus Christ, to all and vpon all that doe beleeue.* His deliuerance temporally was a figure of that spirituall saluation, which both he and we haue by the washing away and forgiuenesse of our sinnes, by the bloud, and death, and resurrection of Iesus Christ, and in the beleefe hereof was it that he was made heire of the righteousnesse of faith. In the second place *Abraham* is brought forth, whose faith *M. Bishop* construeth to be no more but this, that *he beleeued that old and barren persons might haue children if God sayd the word, and that whatsoeuer God promised he was able to performe.* Where if he had looked into the Apostles words with the eyes of a doctor of diuinity, hee would haue found *the seed* there spoken of to be [r] *Christ*, as the same Apostle elsewhere expoundeth it; Christ in person as the head, and all the faithfull gathered as members into one bodie with him, [s] *the head and the bodie making one whole Christ*, as S. *Austin* speaketh. God promised vnto *Abraham* a *seed*, wherein [t] *all the nations of the earth should bee blessed.* Herein God would make him [u] *the heire of the world*, and [x] *a father of many nations*,

l Heb. 11.7.

m *Aug. cont. Faust. Manich. lib. 19. cap. 12. Sacramentum arcæ in qua Noe domus à diluuio liberata est.*

n *Chrysost. in 1. Cor. homil. 7. Mysterium appellatur quoniam non id quod creditum tuetur, sed quod alia videmus, alia credimus.*

o 1. Pet. 3. 21. ἀντίτυπον,

p Rom. 4. 11.

q Cap. 3. 22.

r Gal. 3. 16.

s *Aug. in Psal. 58. Totus Christus caput & corpus, & sic; Christus est totum corpus Christi.*

t Genes. 15. 2.

u Rom. 4. 13.

x Vers. 16, 17.

*tions, not to that ſeed only which is of the law, but to that alſo which is of the faith of Abraham,* that we may know that a ſpirituall *ſeed* is heere to be vnderſtood, which ſhould become the children of *Abraham,* by [y] *walking in the ſteps of the faith of our father Abraham,* and ſo ſhould be made partakers of the *bleſſing with him.* The performance of all this promiſe of bleſſing to *Abraham* and all the nations of the earth, ſtood vpon his hauing of a ſon, which God had promiſed vnto him. The barrenneſſe of *Sara,* and the old age both of *Abraham* and her, might ſeeme to deny al hope of hauing a ſon: but yet *Abraham* reſted ſecure in the affiance of the power of God, not doubting but that God was able, and would giue him a ſon of whom Chriſt ſhould come, to bee vnto him that bleſſing that God had promiſed. This was the thing that *Abrahams* faith reſpected, and to which the Apoſtle referreth it, ſpeaking of a promiſe that was to be *ſure,* not to *Abraham* only, [z] but *to all the ſeede* both of beleeuing Iewes and Gentiles; who are alſo called [a] *heires of the promiſe,* to the performance whereof, to ſhew vnto them *the ſtableneſſe of his counſell, God bound himſelfe by an oath, that by two immutable things, wherein it was vnpoſſible that God ſhould lie,* (his promiſe and his oath) *we might haue ſtrong conſolation, which haue our refuge to hold faſt the hope that is ſet before vs.* Of what? that old and barren perſons may haue children if God ſay the word? O baſe and abiect conceit of ſo diuine and heauenly a matter! Nay but of the *bleſſing,* which as the Apoſtle noteth before, God did ſweare vnto *Abraham,* and vnto that ſeede which hee would multiplie vnto him, by faith to bee bleſſed together with him. Thirdly, he allegeth the faith of the Centurion, of which our Sauiour teſtifieth, that [b] *he had not found ſo great faith in Iſrael.* And what was that faith? *Marrie,* ſaith hee, *that he could with a word cure his ſeruant abſent. Say the word only, quoth he, & my ſeruant ſhall be healed.* But did he onely beleeue that by *ſaying the word* Chriſt could cure his ſeruant? Surely he beleeued ſomewhat elſe that made him to beleeue that: he beleeued ſomewhat elſe that made him to ſay, *Lord I am not worthy that thou ſhouldeſt enter vnder my roofe.* [c] *He would not thus haue ſaid with ſo great faith and humilitie,* ſaith *S. Auſtin, but that he did already beare Chriſt in his heart.* Wee doubt not but he had conceiued of Chriſt that he was the Son of God, the Sauiour of the world, and with this faith came vnto him.

y Verſ. 12.

z Verſ. 16.

a Heb. 6. 17.

b Mat. 8. 10.

c *Aug. de verb. Dom. ſer. 6.* Neque hoc diceret cum tanta fide & humilitate niſi iam illum, quem timebat intrare domũ ſuam, corde geſtaret.

The

The profeſſion of his faith is here mentioned according to the preſent occaſion. It followeth not, that becauſe the act of faith is no further expreſſed here, therefore there was nothing further in his faith for his iuſtification towards God. Yea we hope *M. Beſhop* will not ſay, that he could be iuſtified without beleeuing the remiſſion of ſinnes by the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt, which yet is not expreſſed here; and therefore what doth he but abſurdly and childiſhly to bring vs this example to ſhew what is meant by iuſtifying faith?

d Mat.16 16. Iohn 20.31.

In the other places as touching beleeuing that [d] *Ieſus is Chriſt the Sonne of God*, the queſtion is, what is meant by beleeuing that *Ieſus is Chriſt*. If no more but an act of vnderſtanding barely to aſſent vnto it, then the diuels profeſſe as much, [e] *O Ieſus of Nazaret, I know thee who thou art; euen the holy one of God.* But that we may not make that beleefe a matter common to the diuell, wee muſt vnderſtand it to be a compounded action, not of the vnderſtanding onely, but of the heart, of the will and affections, as appeareth by the third place which to this purpoſe he citeth; [f] *If thou confeſſe with thy mouth the Lord Ieſus, and beleeue with thy hart that God raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaued; for with the heart man beleeueth vnto righteouſneſſe, &c.* So to the Eunuch deſiring to be baptized, *Philip* ſaith, [g] *If thou beleeue with all thine heart, thou maieſt. I beleeue*, ſaith hee, *that Ieſus Chriſt is the Sonne of God.* Beleefe therefore in theſe ſpeeches, importeth ſuch a beleefe, as whereby Chriſt is to our heart that which we beleeue him to be; whereby we beleeue to our owne vſe and comfort, that which we beleeue. It is ſuch a faith as deſireth, ſeeketh, embraceth, holdeth, ioyeth in that which it beleeueth, becauſe therein it ſeeth and apprehendeth peace; whereby we ſo beleeue that Ieſus is Chriſt, as that according to that we beleeue him to be, we beleeue in him, and put our truſt and confidence in him. This is implied in the words *that Ieſus is Chriſt*, that is, the promiſed Meſſias and Sauiour, in whom is promiſed vnto vs, and in whom we looke to finde bleſſing, peace, immortality and euerlaſting life. Notably to this purpoſe Saint *Auſtin* ſaith; [h] *This is to beleeue in Chriſt, euen to loue Chriſt, not as the diuels beleeued and loued not, and therefore albeit they beleeued yet ſaid, What haue we to doe with thee, thou Sonne of God? But let vs ſo beleeue, as that we beleeue in him louing him, and let vs not ſay, What haue we to doe with thee, but rather let vs ſay, We belong*

e Mar.1.24.

f Rom.10.9.

g Acts 8.37.

h *Aug. in Pſal. 130. Hoc eſt credere in Chriſtum diligere Chriſtum, non quomodo demones credebant, ſed non diligebant Chriſtum, & ideo quamuis crederẽt, dicebant, Quid nobis & tibi eſt, fili Dei? Nos autem ſic credamus vt in ipſum credamus, diligentes eum & non dicamus, Quid nobis & tibi eſt. ſed potius dicamus, Ad te peruenimus, tu redemiſti nos. Omnes qui ſic credunt tanquam lapides ſunt viuos de quibus templum Dei ædificatum eſt. & tanquam ligna imputribilia quibus arca illa compacta eſt quæ in diluuio margi non potuit.*

*belong to thee, thou haſt redeemed vs. All that thus beleeue, are as liuely ſtones of which the temple of God is builded, and as thoſe neuer putrifying planks, and timber whereof the Arke was compacted that could not be drowned in the flood.* Such a faith muſt *M Biſhop* confeſſe to be ment in the places by him alledged, that with *Auſtin* he may make a difference betwixt the faith of true Chriſtians and the faith of diuels. By this the anſwer is plaine to the laſt place, which mentioneth only the ſubiect and matter of the Goſpell, but of the manner of *beleeuing* expreſſeth nothing. Only in that it is ſaid that *Chriſt died for our ſins*, there is implied a particular application of that which by the Goſpell we beleeue, as where the ſame Apoſtle ſaith; i *He was deliuered (to death) for our ſinnes, and roſe againe for our iuſtification*, which we cannot bee ſaid truly to beleeue, vnleſſe we beleeue our ſelues to be redeemed and iuſtified from our ſinnes by the death and reſurrection of Ieſus Chriſt. Now then wee deny not, but that the beleefe expreſſed in the articles of the Creed, is that *iuſtifying faith* by which we muſt be ſaued, yet not according to that hiſtoricall meaning which *M. Biſhop* maketh of them, but according to that true meaning of *beleeuing in God*, which the Scripture teacheth, whereby a man can truly ſay, *I beleeue in God*, which *M. Biſhop* cannot tell whether he can ſay or not, and therefore we are ſure that hee cannot ſay. But though he cannot ſay it, yet let him not repine at vs that can; and if he liſt not to haue any part in that faith, whereby hee ſhould apply to himſelfe the righteouſneſſe and merit of Chriſt, to the aſſurance of the forgiueneſſe of ſinnes and euerlaſting life, let him leaue it vnto vs, and wee will ioy therein, and make it indeed the corner ſtone of our religion, becauſe thereby Ieſus Chriſt is our *foundation* and *corner ſtone*, of whom we preſume all things towards God, who can preſume nothing of our ſelues. But at his concluſion of this point I could not but ſmile, where mentioning this faith layed as the corner ſtone of our religion (which the ſycophant, as the Popes *parrot* to ſpeake what he teacheth him, termeth *irreligion*) he inferreth, this being ſo *what morall or modeſt conuerſation, what humility and deuotion can they build vpon it?* It made me call to minde the morall and modeſt conuerſation of their Popes, the humility and deuotion of the moſt of their Cardinals and Biſhops, the ſweet and cleanly life of their Votaries, both religious and ſecular, and by them to conſider what

i Rom. 4. 25.

what good fruits *M. Biſhops* faith hath brought forth amongſt them. It made mee remembera ſtorie that I haue heard out of *Boccace* of a conuerted Iew, of whom hee that conuerted him would by no meanes heare that he ſhould goe to Rome, fearing that the ſight of the behauiour that he ſhould ſee there, would make him renounce Chriſtianity againe. It made mee thinke of the nobles of the Sultan of Babylon, who ſeeing *enormous behauiours ſo to abound at Rome*, refuſed to become Chriſtians, ſaying, [k] *How can water both ſweet and ſalt flow out of one fountaine? Where Chriſtians are bound to draw at the fountaine of Iuſtice, there they find a poyſoned brooke.* It made me call to mind the good vſage and behauiour of the Spaniards in the weſt Indies, where by their extreme villanies and cruelties they haue made the name of Chriſtian religion to ſtink amongſt thoſe poor and vnbeleeuing ſoules. It made me conſider the humility, and deuotion, and great vertue that the Ieſuites and Seculars bewrayed the one of the other, in the late contentions that were amongſt them. It put me in mind of the morall & modeſt conuerſation of *Weſton* the Ieſuite and his fellowes, in hunting the diuell in *Sara Williams*, and many pretty trickes about that matter. Surely *M. Biſhop* if the faith and religion which we profeſſe, did bring forth ſuch *vgly monſters* as your Popes haue bene, or did nouriſh ſuch execrable villanies & filtheries as are practiſed amongſt you, we might iuſtly grow ſuſpicious of it. But thanks bee to God, that though our fruits be not ſuch as they ought to be, yet the face and ſtate of our Church and common welth is ſuch, as that we may boldly tell you, that it is not for a harlot to compare with an honeſt matrone, not for you to make compariſon betwixt vs and you.

k *Mat. Pariſ. in Henrico. 2. Quia Romæ tot ſcaturiunt enormitates dicebãt: Quomodo ex vno fonte aqua dulcis & ſalſa poterit emanare? Vbi Chriſtiani fontẽ iuſtitiæ hauſire tenentur, inuenium laticem toxicatum.*

## 19. W. Biſhop.

*The ſecond difference in the manner of iuſtification, is about the formall act of faith, which* M. Perkins *handleth as it were by the way, cutedly. I will be as ſhort as he, the matter not being great. The Catholikes teach, as you haue heard out of the Councell of Trent, in the beginning of this queſtion, that many acts of faith, feare, hope, and charity doe go before our iuſtification, preparing our ſoule to receiue into it from God through Chriſt that great grace.*

M. Per-

M. Perkins *Doctour like reſoluеth otherwiſe*, That faith is an inſtrument, created by God in the heart of man, at his conuerſion, whereby he apprehendeth and receiueth Chriſts righteouſneſſe, for his iuſtification.

*This ioyly deſcription is ſet downe without any other probation, then his owne authoritie that deliuered it: and ſo, let it paſſe as alreadie ſufficiently confuted. And if there needed any other diſproofe of it, I might gather one more out of his owne explication of it, where he ſaith, that the couenant of grace is communicated vnto vs, by the word of God, and by the Sacraments. For if faith created in our hearts, be the onely ſufficient ſupernaturall inſtrument, to apprehend that couenant of grace, then there needs no Sacraments for that purpoſe, and conſequently I would faine know by the way, how little infants, that cannot for want of iudgment and diſcretion haue any ſuch act of faith, as to lay hold on Chriſt his iuſtice, are iuſtified? Muſt we without any warrant in Gods word contrarie to all experience beleeue that they haue this act of faith, before they come to any vnderſtanding?*

## R. Abbot.

By thoſe *acts of faith, feare, hope, charitie going before iuſtification*, the Councell of Trent doth expreſly conſort it ſelfe with *Pelagius* the heretike. *This faith, feare, hope, charitie*, we muſt know not to be the effects or workes of any *infuſed grace*, which before iuſtification is none, but they are the proper acts of mans *free will*, onely aſſiſted by ſome externall or outward grace, as they by colluſion call it, which as I haue ſhewed before in the queſtion of [a] *Free will*, *Pelagius* the heretike affirmed and graunted as well as they. But hereby they directly croſſe the rule of *S. Auſtin*, that [b] *good workes follow in a man being iuſtified, but they go not before iuſtification*. He ſaith they *do not go before*, they ſay they *do go before*, onely they are not properly meritorious. Meritorious they are alſo [c] *in ſome ſort*, but not properly meritorious *ex condigno*, as the new faith, hope, and charitie are in the iuſtified man. Let the Reader well obſerue it, that there is one faith, hope and charitie before iuſtification, another faith, hope and charitie infuſed when a man is iuſtified. But of that wee ſhall heare more anon. Heare the ſpeciall matter is as touching *M. Perkins* his deſcription of *faith to be an inſtrument ſupernaturall*.

a Sect. 5.

b *Auguſt. de fide & oper. cap. 14. Sequitur iuſtificatum, non praecedit iuſtificandum.*

c *Bellarm. de iuſtific. lib. 1. ca. 17. Fides ſuo quodam modo meretur remiſſionem peccatorum.*

*pernatural created by God in the heart of man at his conuerſion, whereby he apprehendeth and receiueth Chriſts righteouſneſſe for his iuſtification.* This *M. Biſhop* ſaith, is ſet downe without anie proofe, and is alreadie ſufficiently confuted: but where? Surely we haue ſeene much for proofe on *M. Perkins* ſide, but *M. Biſhops* confutation yet we haue not ſeene. Yea where *M. Perkins* did notably demonſtrate this act of faith out of the Goſpell, *M. Biſhop* paſſed it ouer without anie further anſwer but onely to ſay, [d] *He might be aſhamed to vſe this diſcourſe to vs, who admit no part of it to be true*, in which ſort he might eaſily anſwer any thing that he liſt not to admit for truth. But what is it that he would haue to be proued? For that faith is an *inſtrument to apprehend & receiue*, it is plaine, becauſe it is [e] *the hand* which we ſtretch to heauen *to take hold of Chriſt* and *to hold him ſitting there*; it is *the mouth* whereby we *eat and drinke* Chriſt; becauſe [f] *to beleeue is to eat*: it is the *ſtomach* whereby we digeſt him, for [g] *he is to be digeſted by faith*; it is [h] *the foot* whereby we enter poſſeſſion of the *benefits of Chriſt*, and poſſeſſe *ſo farre as we ſtretch the ſame*: it is i *the veſſell* whereinto *God putteth the eyle of his mercy*. [k] *By faith*, ſaith Auſtin, *we receiue Chriſt*: it is [l] *by faith*, ſaith Ambroſe, *that we touch Chriſt*; and [m] *looke how much faith we bring to receiue*, ſaith Cypryan, *ſo much we draw of the abundant grace of God*. This being plaine, the queſtion then muſt be of the thing that is *to be receiued*. Now the thing to be receiued, is the thing whereby we are to be iuſtified. The thing whereby we are to be iuſtified is the *obedience of Chriſt*, for [n] *by the obedience of one*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *ſhall many be made righteous*; and what is the *obedience of Chriſt*, but the *righteouſneſſe* of Chriſt? The *righteouſneſſe of Chriſt* then is the thing to be apprehended and receiued for our iuſtification. And how ſhould we be [o] *made the righteouſneſſe of God in him*, but by apprehending & receiuing a righteouſneſſe which is in him? He is called the [p] *Lord our righteouſneſſe*, not who maketh vs righteous only, but who himſelfe is *our righteouſneſſe*, and how ſhould he be *our righteouſneſſe*, but by his righteouſneſſe? Therefore in apprehending and receiuing Chriſt by faith, we apprehend & receiue the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt to be our iuſtification before God. But I need not ſtand vpon this; for ſeeing through this whole Chapter we ſhall proue, that we receiue no gift of inherent righteouſneſſe, whereby we can be iuſtified in the ſight of God, it followeth, as is alſo proued, that the righ-

d Chap. 3. ſect. 16

e *Aug. in Ioan. tract. 30. Quomodo tenebo abſentem? quomodo in cælum mittam, vt ibi ſedentem teneam? fidem mitte & tenuiſti.*

f *Ibid. tract. 26. Qui credit manducat.*

g *Tertul. de reſur. car. fide digerend.*

h *Bernard. in Cant. ſer. 32. In bonis Domini quatenus fiduciæ pedem porrexeris eatenus poſſidebis.*

i *Idem in Annunc. ſer. 3. Dominus o'cium miſericordiæ niſi in vaſe fiduciæ non ponit.*

k *Aug. de verb. Dom. ſer. 13. Vide illum accipimus.*

l *Ambroſ. in Pſal. 43. Fidei tactus eſt quo tangitur Chriſtus.*

m *Cyprian. lib. 2. epiſt. 2. Quantum fidei capitis afferimus, tantum gratiæ inundantis haurimus.*

n Rom. 5. 19.

o 2 Cor. 5. 21.

p Ierem. 23. 6.

righteouſneſſe which wee receiue by faith for iuſtification, is the merit and obedience of Chriſt imputed vnto vs. Now *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that he can gather a diſproofe of all this out of *M. Perkins* owne explication. *For* ſaith he, *if faith created in our hearts, be the onely ſufficient ſupernatural inſtrument to apprehend the couenant of grace, then there needes no Sacraments for that purpoſe.* But ſuch diſproofes will make men thinke that hee is runne not out of his learning only, but alſo out of his wits. If he will apply that anſwer to *M. Perkins*, it muſt bee thus, If faith bee the onely inſtrument whereby wee apprehend Chriſt, what neede wee any Sacraments to offer him vnto vs? And why did he not as well ſay, what neede there any word of God to that purpoſe? for his diſproofe ſtandeth as good in the one as in the other. But *M. Perkins* ſetteth both downe, as meanes on Gods part to offer Chriſt vnto vs, not as inſtruments or meanes on our part to apprehend and lay hold of Chriſt, and notably obſerueth, how the giuing of bread and wine to the ſeuerall communicants in the Lords Supper, is a pledge and ſigne of Gods particular giuing of Chriſts body and bloud with all his merits, to euerie of them by faith in him. Yea, ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *but how then are infants iuſtified, who cãnot haue any ſuch act of faith?* I anſwer him, that infants dying, are iuſtified and ſaued meerely by vertue of the couenant and promiſe of God, to which they are entitled by the calling and faith of their parents, and in right whereof they are baptized and entred into the body of the Church, God hauing ſaid, [q] *I will be thy God and the God of thy ſeede.* For where the offer of the couenant hath no place, there the meanes of acceptance cannot be required, but by meere and abſolute gift righteouſneſſe and life are giuen, and in the Sacrament ſealed vnto them, who according to the purpoſe of the grace of God, are by inward regeneration made the ſeede of the faithfull, according to the intendiment and meaning of the couenant. Yet nothing hindereth, but that we may conceiue, that God calling infants frõ hence, doth in their paſſage by the power of his Spirit, giue them light of vnderſtanding, and knowledge, and faith of Chriſt, as an entrance to that light and life which after by Chriſt and with him they enioy for euer. Who when hee will, maketh babes and ſucklings to praiſe him, and euen in young children ſometimes in our ſight, ſheweth the admirable fruit of his grace in their death, far beyond

q Gen. 17. 7.

that their yeeres are capeable of. As for infants baptized and continuing to elder yeeres, they are not alwaies iuſtified in being baptized, but God calleth them, ſome ſooner, ſome latter; ſome at one hour, ſome at another, according to his good will and pleaſure, and then the medicine long before applied, beginneth to worke the effect that doth appertaine vnto it.

20. W. BISHOP.

*But to returne vnto the ſounde doctrine of our Catholike faith,* M. Perkins *finds fault with it, one that wee teach faith to go before iuſtification, whereas by the word of God (ſaith he) at the verie inſtant, when any man beleeueth firſt, hee is then both iuſtified and ſanctified. What word of God ſo teacheth? Marrie this:* He that beleeueth, eateth and drinketh the body and bloud of Chriſt, and is already paſſed from death to life. *I anſwer, that our Saviour in that text ſpeaketh not of beleeuing, but of eating his body in the bleſſed Sacrament, which who ſo receiueth worthily, obtaineth thereby life everlaſting, as Chriſt ſaith expreſly in that place. And ſo his proofe is vaine.*

Ioh. 6. 54.

*Now will I proove out of the holy Scriptures, that faith goeth before iuſtification, firſt by that of* S. Paul: Whoſoeuer calleth on the name of our Lord ſhall bee ſaued, but how ſhall they call vpon him, in whom they do not beleeue, how ſhall they beleeue without a preacher, &c. *Where there is this order ſet downe to arriue vnto iuſtification. Firſt, to heare the preacher, then to beleeue, afterward to call vpon God for mercie, and finally mercy is granted and giuen in iuſtification: ſo that praier goeth betweene faith and iuſtification. This Saint* Auguſtine *obſerued, when he ſaid:* Faith is giuen firſt, by which we obtaine the reſt. *And againe:* By the law is knowledge of ſinne, by faith wee obtaine grace, and by grace our ſoule is cured. *If wee liſt to ſee the practiſe of this recorded in holy writ, read the ſecond of the Acts, and there you ſhall find, how that the people hauing heard* S. Peters *Sermon, were ſtriken to the hearts, and beleeued, yet were they not ſtraight way iuſtified, but asked of the Apoſtles what they muſt doe, who willed them to do penance, and to be baptized in the name of Ieſus, in remiſſion of their ſinnes, and then lo, they were iuſtified, ſo that penance and baptiſme went betweene their faith, and their iuſtification.*

Rom. 10.

*De prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 7.*
*De ſpirit. & lit. cap 30.*

*In like maner Queene* Candaces Eunuch, *hauing heard* S. Philip, *announcing vnto him Chriſt, beleeued that* IESVS CHRIST *was the*

*Sonne*

*Sonne of God (no talke in those dayes of applying vnto himselfe Christs righteousnes,) yet was he not iustified, before descending out of his chariot he was baptized. And three daies passed betweene S. Pauls conuersion and his iustification, as doth euidently appeare by the history of his conuersion.* Act. 9.

*The second fault he findeth with our faith, is that we take it to be nothing else, but an illumination of the mind stirring vp the will, which being so moued and helped by grace, causeth in the heart many good spirituall motions. But this (saies* M. Perkins) *is as much to say, that dead men onely helped, can prepare themselues to their resurrection. Not so good Sir, but that men spiritually dead, bee quickned by Gods spirit, may haue many good motions, for as our spirit giueth life vnto our bodies: so the spirit of God by his grace animateth, & giueth life vnto our soules. But of this it hath bene once before spoken at large, in the question of Free will.*

R ABBOT.

We are so to affirme the effect of iustifying faith, as may make good what the Scripture hath deliuered concerning it. Which because the Church of Rome doth not, in making faith precedent in time to iustification and grace, *M. Perkins* iustly findeth fault therewith. Our Sauiour saith, [a] *He that heareth my word and beleeueth in him that sent me, hath euer lasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death to life.* Our passing frō death to life, is our iustification. If euery one that beleeueth bee passed from death to life, then euery one that beleeueth is iustified: or if there be any that beleeueth, & yet is not iustified, then it is not true of euery one that beleeueth, that he is passed from death to life. To this place *M. Perkins* alluded though he quoted it not, but *M. Bishop* thought it safest for him to say nothing of it. To the other place his answer is a simple shift. *He that beleeueth eateth and drinketh the body and blood of Christ. I answer,* saith *M. Bishop, that our Sauiour in that text speaketh not of beleeuing, but of eating his bodie in the blessed Sacrament.* But wee answer him againe, that if Christ speake of eating in the sacrament, then it must follow, that whosoeuer is not partaker of the sacrament of the body and bloud of Christ is excluded from life, because our Sauiour expresly saith, [b] *Except ye eat the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke his bloud, yee*

a Ioh. 5. 24.

b Ioh. 6. 53.

*haue no life in you.* But so to say is absurd and false, as in the example of the crucified theefe and many other, is apparant and plaine. Againe the Sacrament was not instituted long after, and will *M. Bishop* exclude any faithfull, that after this time died, before that institution from that eating of the flesh of Christ and drinking of his bloud, which Christ heere recommendeth for the hauing of eternall life? S. *Austin* saith, that [c] *in baptisme we are made partakers of the body and bloud of Christ, so that though one die before he come to the Sacrament of the Bread and the Cup, yet is he not depriued of the participation and benefit of that Sacrament, seeing he hath found that already which that Sacrament signifieth.* The Apostle testifieth, that the fathers of the old Testament did [d] *all eate the same spirituall meate, and did all drinke the same spirituall drinke*, not the same one with another, as the [e] Rhemists for a shift expound it, but [f] *the same that we do.* For [g] *I find not*, saith S. *Austin*, *how I should vnderstand, The same, but the same that wee eate.* Therefore they also did eate the flesh of Christ and drinke his bloud. But their eating and drinking was not the participation of the Sacrament. Therefore Christ by eating his flesh and drinking his bloud, doth not import any thing tied to the participation of the Sacrament. Yea the whole course of that text giueth vs plainely to vnderstand, that Christ by *eating his flesh and drinking his bloud*, meaneth the same as by *beleeuing in him.* Therefore doth S. *Austin* by the one expound the other. [h] *Beleeue and thou hast eaten; he exhorteth vs to beleeue in him; for to beleeue in him, that is to eate the bread of life; he that beleeueth, eateth.* And so saith hee of the fathers eating and drinking, that this [i] *spirituall meat and drinke was receiued by faith, and not by the body.* Now if *beleefe in Christ* bee imported by *eating and drinking the flesh and bloud of Christ*, then *M. Perkins* proofe was not vaine, but *M. Bishop* hath shewed himselfe a vaine man, to giue so vaine an answer without any proofe therof at all. Without doubt [k] *whosoeuer eateth the flesh of Christ and drinketh his bloud, hath eternall life.* But no man hath eternall life, but he that is iustified and sanctified. Whosoeuer therfore eateth and drinketh the flesh & bloud of Christ is iustified & sactified. But our beleeuing in Christ is our eating of his flesh and drinking of his bloud. So soone therfore as we beleeue in Christ, we are iustified & sanctified, that it may be true which the Apostle saith, that [l] *the righteous-*

c Beda in 1. Cor. 10. ex August. ser. ad infantes.

d 1. Cor. 10. 3. 4.

e Rhem. Annot. 1. Cor. 10.

f Aug. in Ioan. tract. 26. spiritualem eandem quam nos.

g Idem de vtilit. pœnitēt. c. 1. Eundem non inuenio quomodo intelligā nisi eundem quem manducamus & nos.

h Aug. in Ioan. tract. 25. Crede & manducasti. Ibid. tract. 26. Hortans vt credamus in eum. Credere enim in eum, hoc est mādūcare panem viuum. Qui credit manducat.

i Idem de vtilit pœnit. Fide capiebatur, non corpore hauriebatur.

k Ioh. 6. 54.

l Rom. 3. 22.

neſſe of God by the faith of Ieſus Chriſt, is to all and vpon all that do beleeue, which cannot be ſaid, if any beleeue vpon whom there yet is not the Righteouſneſſe of God to iuſtifie him before God. The proofes that hee allegeth to the contrarie, are very ſimple and ſlender. Firſt hee allegeth the words of S. Paul, [m] *Whoſoeuer ſhall call vpon the name of the Lord ſhalbe ſaued, but how ſhall they call vpon him in whom they haue not beleeued? &c.* Where of iuſtification we heare not a word, nor is any thing purpoſely meant thereof. For the words which the Apoſtle citeth out of the Prophet *Ioel*, touch not the order of iuſtification, but import a promiſe to them that are iuſtified by faith in Chriſt, and accordingly doe call vpon the name of the Lord, that in the calamities and confuſion of the world God will preſerue them to bee partakers of euerlaſting ſaluation. Now wee grant that by *order of nature* there is a precedence of faith to iuſtification, but we denie all prioritie in reſpect of *time*. And whereas *M. Biſhop* auoucheth, that *praier goeth betwixt faith and iuſtification*, beſide that it is not proued by the Apoſtles words, it is very vntrue and falſe. For there can bee no true praier without [n] *the ſpirit of grace and of praier*, without [o] *the ſpirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba Father*. The *ſpirit of adoption and grace* is the *ſpirit of ſanctification*. It followeth then that wee pray not but by being firſt ſanctified, and becauſe ſanctification is conſequent to iuſtification, it muſt follow alſo, that iuſtification goeth before praier, ſo that in praying for the forgiueneſſe of ſins, it commeth to paſſe with vs which the Prophet ſaith, [p] *Before they call I will anſwer them*. Let *M. Biſhop* order the matter how he will, yet this muſt alwaies ſtand good, that faith in the firſt inſtant of the being of it, gaſpeth vnto God by praier, as the thirſtie land, and together therewith receiueth bleſſing of God. God tieth not himſelfe to *M. Biſhops* order, but where he giueth faith, in the gift thereof he beginneth with it the whole effect and fruit of faith. As there is no flame without light, but in the beginning of the flame there is iointly a beginning of light, and yet in nature the flame is before the light; ſo is there no faith without iuſtification and ſanctification, and in the firſt act of faith iointly we are iuſtified and ſanctified, albeit in order of nature faith is precedent to the both. Thus are the ſpeeches vnderſtood that he allegeth out of *Auſtin*, and thus they are true, & make nothing at all to ſerue for the pur-

m Rom. 10. 13.

n Zach. 12. 10. Vulgat.

o Rom. 8. 15. Gal. 4. 6.

p Eſa. 65. 24.

pose to which he allegeth them. No more doe those other examples that he bringeth of the baptisme of the people conuerted by *Peters* sermon, of the Eunuch and the Apostle *Paul.* He proueth thereby, that there was some time betwixt their beleeuing and their being baptized; but proueth not that there was any time betwixt their beleeuing & their being iustified. For he must vnderstand, that we do not tie the iustification of a man to the act or instant of his baptisme, and of all these doe affirme, that they receiued the sacrament of baptisme as *Abraham* did the sacrament of circumcision. After iustification, [q] *he receiued the signe of circumcision, as the seale of the righteousnesse of faith which he had when hee was vncircumcised.* Euen so did these receiue the signe of baptisme as the seale of forgiuenesse of sinnes, and of the righteousnesse of faith, which they had embraced and receiued before they were baptized. We reade of *Cornelius* and his companie, that [r] *the holy Ghost came on them, they receiued the holy Ghost* when they were yet vnbaptized, and doth *M. Bishop* doubt but that they were iustified? *Constantine* the Emperour was not baptized [s] till neere his death, and shal we say that til then he was neuer iustified? *Valentinian* was [t] not baptized at all, and yet *Ambrose* doubted not of his iustification. Very idly therefore and impertinently doth *M. Bishop* bring these examples, and gaineth nothing thereby to his cause. I omit his *penance* in stead of *repentance* only, as a toy that he is in loue withall. It is the plaine doctrine of their schooles, [u] *that no penance is to be inioined vnto men in baptisme, or that are to be baptized for any sinnes whatsoeuer, because that should bee a wrong to the passion and death of Christ, as if it were not sufficient for ful satisfaction for the sinnes of the baptized.* Seeing therefore *S. Peter* in the place alleged, expresly directeth his speech to them that were to bee baptized, *M. Bishop* and his fellowes would forbeare there to translate *doing of penance*, but that, poore men, they are afraid they shall bee all vndone, vnlesse they make the Scripture say somewhat by right or by wrong for *doing of penance.* Whether in those daies there were talke of applying Christs righteousnesse, appeareth I hope sufficiently in this discourse. The other fault which M. *Perkins* here findeth with the Romish doctrine, is, that they make faith nothing else but *an illumination of the mind, stirring vp the will, which being so moued and helped by grace, causeth in the heart many*

q Rom. 5. 11.

r Act. 10. 44. 47.

s *Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 4.*

t *Ambros. de obitu Valentin.*

u *Tho. Aqu. p. 3. q. 68. ar. 3. in corp. Ei qui baptizatur pro quibuscunque peccatis, non est alia qua satisfactio iniungenda: hoc enim esset iniuriam facere passioni & morti Christi, quasi ipsa non esset sufficiens ad plenariam satisfactionem pro peccatis baptizatorum.*

good

*good ſpirituall motions.* *M. Biſhop* putteth in (*by grace*) onely to delude the Reader, becauſe hee vnderſtandeth heereby no other grace, but the ſame that *Pelagius* did, as before hath been ſaid. But hereof *M. Perkins* rightly ſaid, that it is as much as if they ſhould ſay, that a dead man onely helped, can prepare himſelfe to his reſurrection. *Not ſo good Sir*, ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *but that men ſpiritually dead, being quickened by Gods ſpirit, may haue many good motions.* I anſwer, you ſay true, good Sir, when a man is quickened by Gods ſpirit: but can a man be quickned before he be quickned? We ſuppoſe that the iuſtifying of a man is the quickning of him, and not we only, but you alſo, in the fiue and twentieth ſection following, doe hold that our iuſtification is the *tranſlating of vs from death to life.* Before iuſtification then wee are not quickened, nor receiue any infuſed or inhabitant grace of the ſpirit of life, wherein ſpirituall life conſiſteth. Therefore to auouch *many good ſpirituall motions* before iuſtification, is to auouch grace without grace, life without life, the ſpirit without the ſpirit, and a quickening of vs before we are quickened. Which becauſe it cannot be, it is true that *M. Perkins* ſaith, that by your doctrine you make a dead man prepare himſelfe to his reſurrection. What you haue ſaid in the queſtion of *Free will*, I hope hath his anſwer ſufficiently in that place.

## 21. W. Biſhop.

The third difference, ſaith *M. Perkins*, concerning faith, is this. Page 84.
The Papiſts ſay, that man is iuſtified by faith, yet not by faith alone, but alſo by other vertues, as the feare of God, hope, loue, &c. The reaſons which are brought to maintain their opinion, are of no moment. Well, let vs heare ſome of them, that the indifferent Reader may iudge, whether they bee of any moment or no.

### First Reason.

Many ſinnes are forgiuen her, becauſe ſhee hath loued much: Luke 7.47.
whence they gather, that the woman there ſpoken of, had pardon of her ſins, & was iuſtified by loue. *Anſwer.* In this text, loue is not made

made an impulsiue cause, to moue God to pardon her sinnes, but only a signe, to shew that God had already pardoned them.

Reply. *Obserue first, that Catholikes do not teach, that she was pardoned for loue alone, for they vse not (as Protestants do) when they find one cause of iustification, to exclude all, or any of the rest: but considering that in sundry places of holy writ, iustification is ascribed vnto many seuerall vertues, affirme, that not faith alone, but diuers other diuine qualities concurre vnto iustification, and as mention here made of loue, excludeth not faith, hope, repentance, and such like: so in other places, where faith is only spoken of, there hope, charitie, and the rest must not also be excluded. This sinner had assured beleefe in Christs power to remit sins, and great hope in his mercy, that he would forgiue them: great sorrow and detestation of her sinne also she had, that in such an assembly did so humbly prostrate her selfe at Christs feet, to wash them with her teares, and to wipe them with the haires of her head. And as shee had true repentance of her former life, so no doubt but shee had also a firme purpose to leade a new life. So that in her conuersion, all those vertues met together, which we hold to concurre to iustification, and among the rest, the preheminence worthily is giuen to loue, as to the principall disposition. She loued our Sauiour as the fountaine of all mercies, and goodnesse, and therefore accounted her precious ointments best bestowed on him; yea, and the humblest seruice, and most affectionate she could offer him, to be all too little, and nothing answerable to the inward burning charitie which she bare him. Which noble affection of hers, towards her diuine Redeemer, no question, was most acceptable vnto him, as by his owne word is most manifest: for he said,* That many sinnes were forgiuen her, because she loued much. *But* M. Perkins *saith, that her loue was no cause that moued Christ to pardon her, but only a signe of pardon giuen before: which is so contrary to the text, that a man not past all shame, would blush once to affirme it. First Christ saith expresly, that it was the cause of the pardon:* Because she had loued much. *Secondlie, that her loue went before, is as plainely declared, both by mention of the time past,* Because she hath loued; *and by the euidence of her fact of washing, wiping, and anointing his feete: for the which saith our Sauiour, then already performed,* Many sinnes are forgiuen her. *So that here can be no impediment of beleeuing the Catholike doctrine, so clearlie deliuered by the holy Ghost, vnlesse one will be so blindly led by our new Masters, that he will beleeue no words of Christ, be they neuer so*

*plaine,*

*plaine, otherwise then it pleaſe the Miniſters to expound them. And this much of the firſt of thoſe reaſons, which* M. Perkins *ſaid were of no moment.*

## R. Abbot.

I wiſhed thee, gentle Reader, before to obſerue that which here plainly thou ſeeſt, that by the Romiſh doctrine there is one faith, hope, charity before iuſtification, which muſt prepare a man in iuſtification to receiue, and is the cauſe for which in iuſtification he doth receiue another; a faith, which is the cauſe why God endueth him with faith; a hope, which is the cauſe for which God endueth him with hope; a charity, which is the cauſe for which God beſoweth vpon him the gift of charity. A ſtrange doctrine, and the ſame for which *Pelagius* was of old condemned, [a] *that vpon our merits the grace of God is beſtowed vpon vs. M. Biſhop* will ſay that they make no *merits* of theſe; yet he himſelfe knoweth that their ſchooles do make them *merits ex congruo*, though not *ex condigno*, merits which are of force to moue God, and which it is conuenient that God ſhould reſpect, though they do not fully deſerue grace. And this *merit* [b] *Bellarmine* himſelfe affirmeth, as before was ſaid. But let vs know why they account them not properly *merits*. The reaſon indeed is, becauſe they ſay they are not the effects of any infuſed grace; for they make them intrinſecally the acts onely of mans *free will*, though adioyning the ſhew of a counterfeit grace, which doth as it were put a hand vnder the arme to helpe lift it vp for the acting thereof. Yet *M. Biſhop* at randon not knowing what he ſaith, calleth the *diuine qualities*, contrary to the doctrine of his owne ſchooles. For if faith, hope, and charity before iuſtification be *diuine qualities*, and eſſentially the works of grace, there can nothing hinder, but that they ſhould bee as properly meritorious as thoſe infuſed graces, wherein they affirme iuſtification to conſiſt. But now he muſt vnderſtand, that the Fathers did not take *merit* ſo ſtrictly, as that they giue him way to ſhift off from himſelfe the aſſertion of *Pelagius*. They vnderſtood it ſo largely, as that [c] *if a man can but plead a iuſt excuſe for his deliuerance he that vſeth it is not deliuered by grace but by merit*; if there be but [d] *a good will before grace, then grace is not grace, but is giuen vpon merit*. And if he will ſay, that they affirme not any *good will before grace*, let

a *Auguſt. epiſt. 46*

b *Bellarm. de iuſtif. lib. 1. cap. 17. Fides ſuo quodam modo meretur remiſſionem peccatorum iuſtificat per modum diſpoſitionis ac meriti.*

c *Auguſt. epiſt. 105 Si excuſatio iuſta eſt quiſquis ea vtitur, non gratia ſed merito liberatur.*

d *Cont. 2. epiſt. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 19. Pro meritis videlicet voluntatis bonæ: ac ſic gratia non ſit gratia ſed ſit illud &c. gratiam Dei ſecundum merita noſtra dari.*

let him remember, that *Pelagius* affirmed such a preuenting grace as they do, but *S. Austine* professeth to know no grace, but iustifying grace, as hath bene shewed [e] before, so that if before iustifying grace, there be any good will or good worke, then the grace of God is not freely giuen, but by merit, according to the doctrine of *Pelagius*. Yea, *Bellarmine* himselfe confesseth, that the [f] *Fathers do vnderstand the grace of God to be giuen by merits, when any thing is done by our owne strength, in respect whereof grace is giuen, though the same be not any merit de condigno, of condignity or worth.* Such are the faith, hope, and charity, that they teach before iustification, which therefore as I haue said, are denied to be merits *de condigno*, because they proceede from our owne strength. Yea, say they, but not without the helpe of God. But so *Pelagius* also said, as wee haue shewed in the place before quoted in the question of *Free wil*, and therefore in that they say nothing to free themselues from saying that which the Fathers condemned in *Pelagius*, that according to *our merits the grace of God is bestowed vpon vs*. And this *M. Bishop* will proue by the example of the woman, who in the Pharisees house washed the feete of Christ, of whom our Sauiour saith; [g] *Many sinnes are forgiuen her, because she hath loued much.* She was iustified therefore, saith he, because of her loue. *M. Perkins* answereth, that that *because* importeth not any impulsiue cause of the forgiuenesse of her sinnes, but onely *a signe* thereof, as if Christ had said, It is a token that much hath been forgiuen her, because shee loueth much. But *M. Bishop* like to bad disposed persons, who face the matter most boldly, where their cause is woorst, saith, that *this is so contrary to the text, that a man not past all shame, would blush once to affirme it.* The text of it owne accord yeeldeth this construction & no other. The creditour forgiueth to one fiue hundred talents, to the other fifty: whether of them will loue him more? Hee, saith the Pharisee, to whom hee forgaue most. Heere is loue expresly set downe, as a thankfulnesse following after, in respect of a forgiuenesse gone before. Christ then in effect inferreth thus, Thou hast giuen me smal tokens of thy loue, since my entring into thy house, but thus and thus hath she shewed her loue. What is the cause? [h] *O thou Pharisee, therefore thou louest little, because thou thinkest that little is forgiuē thee: not because it is little, but because thou thinkest it to be but little.* But this woman knoweth that much hath bene forgiuen

e Cha. 1. sect. 5.

f Bellarm. de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 6. cap. 5. Gratiam secundum merita nostra dari intelligunt patres, cùm aliquid fit propriis viribus (etiamsi non sit meritum de condigno) ratione cuius datur gratia.

g Luk. 7. 47.

h August. hom. 23 O Pharisee, ideo parum diligis quia parum tibi dimitti suspicaris non quia parum dimittitur, sed quia parum putas esse quod dimittitur.

giuen her, therefore shee loueth much. And this exposition is apparentlie confirmed by the words which Christ addeth, *To whom a little is forgiuen, he doth loue a little:* which if we will fit to the words going before, *Many sinnes are forgiuen her, because shee hath loued much,* we must make the meaning of these former words to be this; But shee loueth much; it is a signe therefore that much hath beene forgiuen her. In this meaning *Ambrose* maketh this woman a figure of the Church of the Gentiles, [i] *to which there was more forgiuen, because she was indebted more, but being mindfull of this grace, hath paied so much the more* (in loue) *by how much the greater mercy she had obtained.* And to the same sense doth he expound it, [k] writing vpon the place, euen as *Basil* also doth, when alluding to that place, he saith: [l] *To him that oweth more, more is forgiuen, that he may loue the more.* So doth *Hierome* take it, saying, [m] *Of two debters, to whom more is forgiuen, he loueth more; thereupon our Sauiour saith, Many sins are forgiuen her, because shee hath loued much;* which cannot hang together, if loue bee taken for an effect of forgiuenesse in the one speech, and a cause thereof in the other. But now wee expect, that Master *Bishop* so peremptorily reiecting that exposition, should giue vs some greater reason of the denying of it. *First,* saith he, *Christ saith expresly that it was the cause of the pardon; because she had loued much.* But his learning should teach him, that the word *because* doth not alwaies note an antecedent cause, but sometimes a succeeding effect or signe. As where our Sauiour Christ saith of the diuell, [n] *he abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him;* he did not meane to say, that the cause of his not abiding in the truth, was because now there is no truth in him, but that hereby as by an effect & signe, it appeareth that he abode not in the truth. So where he saith; [o] *I haue called you friends, because al things that I haue heard of the Father I haue made knowne vnto you;* hee maketh this imparting of all things to them not a cause, but a token of accounting them his friends. Which being euident and plaine, *M. Bishops* first reason hindereth nothing, but that Christs words may well be vnderstood, that he nameth the womans loue only as a signe & token of many sinnes to bee forgiuen vnto her. And to take it otherwise as he doth, ouerthroweth the rule that is deliuered by *S. Augustine:* [p] *Good works begin from the time that wee are iustified, wee are not iustified for any good workes that goe before.* His second reason is

i *Ambro. de Tobia cap. 22. Plus remissum est ecclesiæ quia plus debebat; sed & ipsa plus soluit, &c. Memor gratiæ eò plura soluit, quo plura meruisset.*

k *In Luc. cap. 7.*

l *Basil. exhort. ad baptism. Plus debenti plus remittatur vt vehementius amet.*

m *Hieron. adu. Iouin. lib. 3. De duobus debitoribus cui plus dimittitur plus amat. Vnde & saluator ait, &c.*

n Ioh. 8. 44.

o *Ibid. cap. 15. v. 15. ὃν τρόπον, &c.*

p *Aug. epist. 120. cap. 30. Ex hoc incipiunt bona opera ex quo iustificamur, non quia præcesserunt iustificamur.*

lesse

leſſe worth, and he ſheweth therein either his ignorance or his negligence. For whereas he argueth out of the Tenſes, that her loue is expreſſed by the time paſt, *ſhe hath loued much*, and her forgiuenelle by the time preſent, *Many ſinnes are forgiuen her*, importing that the former cannot be the ſigne, and therefore muſt needes be the cauſe of that that followeth, if hee had beene ſo carefull as to looke into the Greeke text, he ſhould haue founde that her forgiuenelle of ſinnes is expreſſed alſo by the time paſt, by the Atticke preterperfect tence ἀφέωνται; *Many ſinnes haue beene forgiuen her, becauſe ſhe hath loued much*; albeit it ſhould not haue noted neceſſarily a preſent act, but a continuation of the benefit, if it had beene expreſſed in the preſent tence. The expoſition therefore alledged, beeing direct, and ariſing ſimply out of the text it ſelfe, what reaſon hath *M. Biſhop* to force another, which plainly thwarteth that which Chriſt after ſaith, *Thy faith hath ſaued thee?* To conclude, let him take for his reproofe, that which *Origen* ſaith; ¶ *For no worke of the Law* (and therefore not for her loue) *but for faith onely doth Chriſt ſay to the woman, Thy ſinnes are forguen thee, and againe, Thy faith hath ſaued thee*: and let him learne to condemne his own preſumption, in that he taketh vpon him ſo raſhly to define, that which hee is not able, by reaſon to make good. As for the Miniſters, they are verie ſimple men, if they cannot better approoue their expoſitions and doctrines then he hath done.

h. *Origen. ad Rom. cap. 3. Ex nullo legis opere ſed pro ſola fide ait ad eam: Remittuntur, &c.*

## 22. W. BISHOP.

Cal. 3. 6.

2. *Reaſon.* Neither Circumciſion, nor prepuce, auaileth any thing, but faith that worketh by charity. Hence Catholikes gather, that when the Apoſtle attributeth iuſtification to faith, hee meanes not faith alone, but as it is ioyned with charity, and other like vertues, as are requiſite to prepare the ſoule of man, to receiue that cõplete grace of iuſtification. *M. Perkins anſwereth, that they are ioyned together*: But it is faith alone that apprehendeth Chriſts righteouſneſſe, and maketh it ours. It vieth charity as an inſtrument to performe the duties of the firſt and ſecond table, but it hath no part with faith in the matter of our iuſtification.

Reply. *That it hath the chiefeſt part, and that faith is rather the inſtrument and handmaid of charity; my proofe ſhall be out of the very*

*text*

text alledged, where life and motion is giuen to faith by charity, as the Greeke word Energoumene being passiue, doth plainly shew, that faith is moued, led and guided by charitie. Which S. Iames doth demonstrate most manifestly, saying, that Euen as the body is dead without the soule, so is faith without charity: *Making charity to bee the life, and as it were the soule of faith: Now no man is ignorant, but it is the soule that vseth the body, as an instrument, euen so then it is charity, that vseth faith as her instrument and inferiour, and not contrariwise:* which S. Paul *confirmeth at large in a whole chapter, proouing charity to be a more excellent gift then faith, or any other, concluding with these words:* Now there remaineth faith, hope, and charitie; these three, but the greater of these is charitie. 1. Cor. 13. *Whereupon* S. Austine *resolueth thus:* Nothing but charity maketh faith it selfe auailable; for faith (*saith he*) may be without charity, but it cannot be auailable without it: *So that first you see that charity is the mouer and commander, and faith, as her instrument and handmaid.* Li. de Trinit. cap. 18.

*Now that in the work of iustification, it hath the chiefe place, may be thus proued: I demaund whether that worke of iustification by faith be done, for the loue of God, and to his honor or no? If not, as it is voide of charity, so it is a wicked and sinfull act, no iustification, but infection, our owne interest being the principall end of it: now if it comprehend and conclude Gods glory, & seruice in it, that is, if they apply Christs right and ouerseruice to them, to glorify God thereby, then hath charity the principall part therein: for the directing of al, to the honor and glory of God is a proper office and action of charity. All this reason that charity both concurreth to iustification, and that as principall* S. Austine *confirmeth in these words:* The house of God, (*that is a righteous and godly soule,*) hath for his foundation faith; hope is the walles of it; but charity is the roofe and perfection of it. Serm. 21. de verbis Apostol.

R. Abbot.

Here *M. Bishop* was loth to trouble himselfe too much with M. *Perkins* answer, who truly obserueth the difference betwixt faith & charity, that the proper act of faith is to take and receiue to vs; the proper act of loue, to giue our selues forth to others. Seing thē that iustification is a thing to be receiued, the same must needs be performed properly by faith, but not by charity, because charity is no instrument

instrumẽt to receiue. But yet faith receiuing all of God, vseth charity, as the means to make return of itselfe to God againe, & by charity, as a working hãd performeth all the duties cõmanded of God, to the honor and glory of God. This therefore the Apostle intendeth in the place alledged, that faith hauing alone iustified vs by receiuing the gift of righteousnesse, which is by the merit of Iesus Christ, doth not stay there, but goeth forth by charity, to serue God, to serue one another, and to shew our selues thankfull vnto God. And wonder it were, that the Apostle hauing before professedly disputed the matter of iustification, & referring the same wholy to faith, should here crosse all that he hath before said, and tell vs, that not onely faith, but loue also must concurre to make vp our iustification before God. Marke it well, gentle reader, that where the Apostle purposely speaketh of the meanes of iustification, *M. Bishop* can finde nothing to proue, that we are iustified by loue, nothing pleaded but onely faith; but heere where the Apostle describeth only the condition of the faith by which we are iustified, here he will finde somewhat whereby to plead against the Apostles former doctrine, yea, and will proue, that loue hath not onely a part, but *the chiefest part* in our iustification, and *that faith is rather the instrument or handmaid of charity*. How much is he beholding to his Maister *Bellarmin*, that hath taught him such a trick, and furnished him with a deuice, which neuer any Father Greeke or Latine, neuer any translatour could light vpon, till his admirable wit had found it out? We may well think that such a head could not but deserue a Cardinals hat. Forsooth the text proueth, that *life and motion is giuen to faith by charitie*. But how so? [a] *Marry the Greeke word* ἐνεργέω *being passiue, doth plainely shew, that faith is moued, led, and guided by charity*. But what? must we, *M. Bishop*, vpon *Bellarmines* word and yours take this, without any further authority or warrant so to do? Indeede it is true, that the Greeke word sometimes is taken passiuely, but by the Apostle is more often vsed in the actiue signification, and in this place was neuer before by any Father Greeke or Latine taken otherwise. Yea, the spite is, that the vulgar Latine interpreter to whom they are tied by the Councell of Trent, crosseth this deuice, for he readeth as we doe, *Fides quæ per charitatem operatur, faith which worketh by loue*. But there is a trick to salue that too; for saith *Bellarmine*, [b] *the word* (opera-

a Bellarm. de iustific. lib. 2. cap. 4.

b Illud (operatur) passiue) accipiendum est, non a. lini.

(*operatur*) must be taken passiuely, not actiuely. Now what blockheads were the Diuines of Rhemes, that could not see so much, or would omit so materiall a proofe against the heretikes? for they haue translated as wee do, *faith which worketh by loue*. But they were bashfull; they thought *Bellarmine* could crie out the matter with his name and countenance, but it would be condemned for a great fault in them. *Better it is for some man to steale a horse, then for another to looke ouer the hedge.* They knew well, that euerie childe would crie out vpon them for leud men, if they had translated *operatur* passiuely, in as much as neither their owne interpreter in any other place, nor any other Latine author hath euer vsed it in that sort. Againe, they saw that a very grosse and palpable absurdity would thereupon haue ensued, which on their owne part cannot be denied. For if they had translated, *faith which is wrought by loue*, then it would haue followed, that *loue* by which faith is wrought, must needes be before faith, whereas they all acknowledge that faith hath the first being, according to that which *M. Bishop* a little [c] before alledged out of *Austin*, *faith is giuen first, by which we obtaine the rest*. Which being a principle in diuinitie, and accorded on both sides, they could not tell how to make good, if they should haue said that *faith is wrought by loue*. Now *M. Bishop*, though for the rest he would aduenture vpon his Maisters credit, yet durst not follow him so farre, as to translate *operatur* passiuely, but onely beateth about the bush, and telleth vs, that the Greeke sheweth, that faith is *moued, led, and guided by charity*: Wherein he doth wrong to the Rhemists his country-men, to whom for countries sake he should haue done that honour, to stand to their translation. Yea, and he abuseth his Reader, in that he doth not directly translate the place; which if he had done, he durst not translate it, to giue that meaning that now he maketh of it. Which meaning of his cannot in any sort be true, because faith which first beareth, & beleeueth, and receiueth the words of God, & thereby prescribeth vnto charity the way that it is to go, and the duty that it is to performe, without which what is charity, but a wild & a wandring affection, easily swarued and caried away from the due respect and loue of God? so that by faith it is that charity pleaseth God, and [d] *without faith it is impossible to please God*. Now seeing with God we cannot thinke, that the greater is accepted for the

[c] Sect. 20. *August. de praedest. sanct. ca. 5.*

[d] Heb. 11. 6.

lesse, but rather the lesse for the greater, not the mistresse (so to speake) for the handmaides sake, but rather the handmaid for the mistresse sake, we must needes make faith not *the handmaid*, as *M. Bishop* doth, but the mistresse, because by faith it is that charity is acceptable vnto God. But he telleth vs, that *S. Iames* doth *demonstrate charity to be the life, and as it were the soule of faith, when he saith, Euen as the body is dead without the soule, so is faith without charity*. But he wrongeth his Reader, in citing thus falsly the words of *S. Iames*. For *S. Iames* saith not, *so is faith without charity*, but *so is faith without workes*. Now charity cannot be without workes, but if there might not be workes without charity, *S. Paul* would not
e 1. Cor. 13. haue said, e *Though I feede the poore with all my goods, and though I giue my body to be burned and haue not loue, it profiteth me nothing.* Charity is inwardly the affection of the heart, seene onely to God: but workes are outwardly visible and apparent to man, and therefore there is a difference to be made betwixt charity and workes, which wholy ouerthroweth all that *M. Bishop* here goeth about to proue. For the faith whereof wee heere dispute, is inward in the
f Rom. 10. 10. heart, because with f *the heart man beleeueth vnto righteousnesse.* But that which is without, cannot be the life or soule of that which is within, nay it selfe hath from within all the life that it hath, and if it receiue not life from within, it is altogether dead. Workes therefore being outward, and issuing from within, if they be true, can by no meanes be said to be the life of faith that is within. But that which *S. Iames* saith, he saith it of *workes*. He saith nothing therefore, to proue that *charity* is the *life and soule* of faith. But how then, will he say, doth Saint *Iames* make *workes*, as it were *the life and soule of faith*? Very well, according to that meaning of faith which he there intendeth. For he speaketh of *faith*, as it is out-
g Iam. 2. 14. 18. wardly professed to men. g *Thou sayest thou hast faith, shew me thy faith: I will shew thee my faith.* Now in this respect, *workes* are rightly said to be *the life of faith*; not *charity*, but *workes*, because charity cannot be discerned by the eies of men, but workes of behauiour and conuersation are discerned. Yea, there may be a profession of the faith and works thereunto correspondent outwardly, when yet there is neither faith nor charity within. Yet where it is so, men outwardly to men and to the Church, go for no other but liuing members of the Church, vntill such time as the winde of temp-

temptation bloweth them away, and discouereth them to haue been but chaffe, when in semblance they seemed to be good corn. But where there is outward profession of faith, and there is not conuersation thereunto agreeing, a man is accounted but a dead branch fitte to bee cut off; his profession wanteth that that should giue it life and grace; he is euerie mans by-word and reproch, his hypocrisie is detested of all men, and therefore is much more lothsome vnto God. In a word, *S. Paul* speaketh of faith in one meaning, as it is inward in the heart to God: *S. Iames* speaketh of faith in another meaning, as it is outward in the face to men. If we vnderstand it according to Saint *Paul*, it is faith that giueth life to all the rest, as afterwards shall further appeare. If wee vnderstand it according to Saint *Iames*, workes are the life of faith, and giue it name and beeing, because a man is not accounted faithfull for his words, vnlesse there be also workes agreeable to his words. Now therefore Master *Bishops* comparison, whereby hee would make charitie as the life and soule, and faith as the body, cannot bee made good out of this place, nay indeede it cannot bee made good at all. For that which must bee as the *life and soule*, must bee the internall and essentiall forme of the thing. But [h] *charitie* is to *faith a forme only extrinsecall and outward, not an inward forme*, saith Bellarmine, *not giuing it his beeing, but only his mouing, actiuity, and working*. Charitie therefore cannot bee called the life and soule of faith. Now because it is but an outward and accidentall forme, the mouing and working that it giueth vnto faith, is but outward and accidentall. For the proper and naturall act and motion of a thing, cannot proceed from an accidentall forme. Faith therefore hath it own inward & essentiall forme, whereby it hath life & being within it selfe, & whence proceedeth a motiō & working that is proper to it selfe. And thus doth the Apostle set it down distinctly, as a vertue absolute in it self, whē he saith, [i] *Now abide these three, faith, hope, and loue*. Where to say that *faith* is as the *body*, & *loue* as the *soule*, is to make the Apostle to speake absurdly, as if a man for two should reckō a body & a soule. According to this distinctiō doth the scripture still set forth faith in the nature of faith, to be the instrumēt of our iustificatiō before God, euen according to that life & soule that is, that proper & essential forme, whereby it hath the being of faith, which yet iustifying vs, receiueth charity as an accidentall forme

h Bellarm. de iustificat. lib. 2 cap. 4. Forma fidei extrinseca, non intrinseca, & quae det illi non vt sit sed vt moueatur; sit res actuosa & operans.

i 1. Cor. 13. 13.

to be vnto it an instrument for mooving and stirring abroad, in the performance of all duties recommended vnto vs both to God and men. Thus *Bellarmine* perforce wresteth from *M. Bishop*, yea and from himselfe also, this assertion of faith, being likened to the body, & charity to the soule. Yet *M. Bishop* once againe will assay to proove it by *S. Paul*, making *charity a more excellent gift then faith*, reckoning *faith, hope, and charity*, & concluding, *the greatest of these is charity*. But this testimonie availeth him nothing at all; for it followeth not, that because the eie is a more excellent member then the eare, therefore the eie is as the life and soule to the eare, or the eare the instrument of the eie. No more doth it follow, that because charitie is a more excellent gift then faith, therefore it should bee the forme and life of faith, or faith the instrument of charitie: It followeth not, that because the eie is more excellent then the eare, therefore for the vse of hearing, it should be more excellent then the eare. No more doth it follow, that because charitie is more excellent then faith, therefore for the vse of iustification it must excell faith. Faith and charitie respectiuely haue the preferment each of other. If we respect latitude of vse, charitie is more excellent then faith, as which is extended euery way to God, to Angels, to men, and by which all the gifts of God which he bestoweth vpon vs, are made profitable to other men, so as that k *vnprofitably he hath all*, saith Austin, *who maketh not that one whereby hee should vse all.* l *No gift*, saith Chrysostome, *is perfect or conuenient without charitie. What soeuer grace or gift a man hath obtained, beeing destitute of charity, it will not stand; because what soeuer God imparteth or giueth, either is perfected by charity, or without charitie, it commeth to no effect or vse.* But if we consider a man priuately in himselfe, and for his owne vse, faith is more excellent then charity, as wherein originally standeth our cõmunion and fellowship with God; m *by which Christ dwelleth in our hearts*; into which as a hand God putteth al the riches of his grace for our saluation; and by which whatsoeuer else is in vs, is commended vnto God. We haue nothing in vs pure, nothing cleane, nothing but what is corrupted & defiled, but faith salueth all, healeth all, sanctifieth Christ betwixt God and vs, that for his sake hee may bee mercifull vnto vs. Againe, if we respect latitud of time & cõtinuance, charity is to be preferred before faith. For faith is but for a time, and when

k *Aug. de verb. Dom. ser. 18. vniuersa inutiliter habet, qui vnum illud quo vniuersa vtatur non habet.*

l *Chrysost. hom. de fide, spe & charit. Nullum charisma sine charitate perfectum est; nullum donum sine charitate aptum. Quicquid enim charismatu aut doni quisque meruerit, de seruum charitate non stabit. Omnia enim quæ Sp. sanctus dat, otia aut imperfecta aut donat aut charitate perficiuntur, aut sine charitate effectum nullum sortiuntur.*

m Ephes. 3. 17.

the

the promiſe of God, which is the matter or ſubiect of it, ſhall bee fully accompliſhed, the vſe of it ſhall ceaſe. But charity and loue abideth for euer, and ſhall continue betwixt God and vs an euerla-ſting bond. Therfore *Origen* ſaith, [n] *Onely loue it is that neuer faileth therfore it is more excellent then prophecie, then faith, then knowledge, then martyrdom.* [o] *Only charity is eternal*, ſaith Chryſoſtom, *becauſe with God it is in the ſaints: for that cauſe it is the greater.* The ſame reaſon *S. Auſtine* alſo giueth, [p] *becauſe*, ſaith he, *when a man is come to things eternall, theſe two* (faith and hope) *failing, charity ſhall remaine more increaſed, and better aſſured.* In few words to reſolue *M. Biſhop* in this behalfe, we ſay that [q] *the end is more excellent, then thoſe things which pertaine to the end:* The end of our faith & iuſtificatiō is charity, that is, the ful reſtoring of vs to the image of God the very ſumme and effect whereof is loue. Abſolutely therfore to ſpeake it is true, that *loue* is greater & more excellent thē faith But when we ſpeake of the meanes of iuſtification & attainment of that ſaluation, wherto perfect charity and righteouſneſſe doth belong, then faith muſt be preferred as the greater and more excellent, faith onely beareth ſway therein, and this ſlender & weak charity which here we haue, is of no effect or moment therunto. To ſaue a man, I ſay, faith is the greater; in man being ſaued charity is the greater. Till faith haue finiſhed our ſaluation, loue muſt yeeld to faith; When faith hath fully ſaued vs, it ſhall haue an end, but loue which ſimply is the greater, ſhall abide for euer. Now as touching the place of *Auſtin*, he ſpeaketh there of faith according to vulgar vnderſtanding, in like ſort as *S. Iames* doth. He ſpeaketh of a faith that *may be without charity*, which true faith cannot bee. [r] *Godly faith*, ſaith the ſame Auſtin, *wil not be without hope and charity. For* [t] *if a man haue faith without hope and loue*, ſaith he, *he beleeueth Chriſt to be, but he beleeueth not in Chriſt.* But that onely is the true iuſtifying faith, wherby a man beleeueth in Chriſt, which taketh not his life and force of loue, but incorporating vs into Chriſt, receiueth of him [s] *the ſpirit of loue*, and by Chriſt giueth life and force to all the fruits and workes thereof. Faith then as it is profeſſed to men, may be without charity, but being without charity, it profiteth nothing, nor can ſtand vs in any ſteed with God: but true faith is neuer diuided from charity, nor can bee, and therfore of it Saint *Auſtine* ſpeaketh not. That which he would

n *Origen. in numer. hom. 14. Sola charitas nunquam excidit; ideo ſuper prophetiam, ſuper fidē, ſuper ſcientiā ſuper ipſū etiam martyrium charitas habenda eſt.*

o *Chryſoſt. hom. de fide, ſpe & charit. Sola charitas æterna eſt, quia cum Deo in ſanctiū eſt: ideo maior eſt.*

p *Auguſt. de doct. Chriſt. lib. 1. ca. 39. Quia cùm quiſque ad æterna peruenerit, duobus iſtis decedentibus charitas auctior & certior permanebit.*

q *Ariſtot. Topic.*

r *Auguſt. epiſt. 85. Pia fides ſine ſpe & charitate eſſe non vult.*

s *Idem de verb. Dom. ſer. 61. Si fidem habet ſine ſpe & dilectione, Chriſtum eſſe credit, non in Chriſtū credit.*

t *2. Tim. 1. 7.*

seeme to inferre, is without any premisses, and apparantly false by the very words heere questioned. For if *faith worketh by loue*, then faith is the worker, that is, the mouer and commaunder, and *loue* the instrumen: by which it worketh, and as absurd it must needes be, to say, that *charity or loue* is the commaunder, and *faith* the instrument, as to say, the axe is the commaunder of the Carpenter that heweth with it, or the Carpenter the instrument of the axe. For conclusion of this section, Maister *Bishop* wil giue vs a reason to proue, that *in the worke of iustification charity hath the chiefest place.* First he asketh full wisely, whether that worke of iustification by faith, *be done for the loue of God, and to his owne honour or no?* Iustification is the worke of God, who is [u] *the iustifier of him that is of the faith of Iesus.* His question is this, whether God doe iustifie vs for the loue of God? But I answer him, that the finall end of our iustification, is the honour and glory of God, who hath [x] *predestinated vs to be adopted through Iesus Christ vnto himselfe, to the praise of the glory of his grace.* And what of that? *Marry then hath charitie the principall part therein*, saith he, *for the directing of all to the honour and glory of God, is the proper office and action of charity.* But therein hee deceiueth himselfe, for the Apostle hath expressed it as the very proper office and act of faith, [y] *To giue glory vnto God*; & therefore *Moses* and *Aaron* at the waters of strife, are said [z] *not to haue sanctified the Lord*, that is to say, not to haue giuen him glory, because *they beleeued him not.* For [a] *not to beleeue God, is to make him a liar*, which is the reproch and dishonour of God; but to beleeue God, is to ascribe vnto him, truth, and power, and wisedome, and iustice, and mercie, and whatsoeuer else belongeth vnto him. Therefore *Arnobius* saith, that [b] *to do well belongeth to the glory of man, but to beleeue well, concerneth the glory of God.* [c] *By works*, saith Chrysostome, *we obey God, but faith entertaineth a meete opinion concerning God, and glorifieth, and admireth him much more then the shewing forth of workes. Workes commend the doer, but faith commendeth God onely, and what it is, it is wholy his. For it reioyceth in this, that it conceiueth of him great things, which do redound to his glory.* And whereas our Sauiour in the Gospell teacheth vs, that our good works do glorifie God, saying, *Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorifie your father which is in heauen*, he saith, that it is of faith that our good works do glorifie

God.

u Rom. 3. 26.

x Ephe. 1. 5. 6.
y Rom. 4. 20.
z Num 20. 12. 2. 1. Ihn 5 10.
b *Arnob. in Psal. 119. Bene facere ad gloriam hominis, benè credere ad gloriam Dei pertinet.*
c *Chrysost. ad Rom hom. 8. Qui mandata illius implet obedit ei: hic autē (qui credit) conuenientem de ea opinionem accipit, eumque glorificat atque admiratur nullo magis quam operū demonstratio. Illa ergò gloriatio eius est qui rectè facti aliquod præstitit. hec autem Deum ipsum glorificat ac quanta est tota ipsius est. Gloriatur enim ob hoc quid magni quædam de eo concipiat quæ ad gloriam eius redundant.*

God.[d] *behold*, saith he, *it appeareth that this commeth of faith.* M. *Bishops* argument therefore maketh against himselfe, and proueth that we are iustified rather by faith then by charity, because it is faith principally that yeeldeth honour vnto God. The last place alleadged out of *Austin*, is nothing against vs: for although we defend that a man is iustified by faith alone, yet wee say that both faith, hope, and charity must concurre, to accomplish the perfection of a Christian man, whereof anon we shall see further.

[d] *Ibid. Ecce hoc fidei esse apparuit.*

## 23. W. BISHOP.

*The third of these trifling reasons, is peruersly propounded by* M. *Perkins thus.* Faith is neuer alone, therefore it doth not iustifie alone: *That this argument is fondly framed, appeareth plainely, in that that Catholikes do not deny, but affirme, that faith may be without charity, as it is in all sinful Catholiks, we then forme the reason thus. If faith alone be the whole cause of iustification, then if both hope and charity were remoued from faith (at least by thought, and in conceipt,) faith would neuertheless iustifie. But faith considered without hope and charity, wil not iustifie: ergo, it is not the whole cause of iustification. The first proposition cannot be denied of them, who know the nature and propriety of causes, for the entire and total cause of any thing, being (as the Philosophers say) in act the effect must needs follow, & very sense teacheth the simple, that if any thing be set to worke, and if it doe not act that whereto it is set too, then there wanted some thing requisite. And consequently, that was not the whole cause of that worke.*

*Now to the second proposition.* But their imagined faith cannot apply to themselues Christs righteousnesse, without the presence of hope and charity. *For else he might be iustified without any hope of heauen, and without any loue towards God, and estimation of his honor, which are things most absurd in themselues: but yet very well fitting the Protestant's iustification, which is nothing else but the plaine vice of presumption, as hath beene before declared. Let to auoid this inconuenience which is so great,* M. Perkins *graunteth, that both hope and charity must needs be present at the iustification, but doe nothing in it, but faith doth al, as the head is present to the eie, when it seeth, yet it is the eie alone that seeth. Here is a worthy peece of Philosophy, that the eie alone doth see, whereas in truth it is but the instrument of seeing, the soule being the principal cause of sight, as it is of al other actions of life, sense, & vn-*

*ſon: and it is not to purpoſe here, where we require the preſence of the whole cauſe, and not onely of the inſtrument all cauſe. And to returne your ſimilitude vpon your ſelfe, as the eie cannot ſee without the head, becauſe it receiueth influence from it, before it can ſee, ſo cannot faith iuſtifie without charity, becauſe it neceſſarily receiueth ſpirit of life from it, before it can do any thing acceptable in Gods ſight.*

R. Abbot.

He may indeede very iuſtly call them *trifling reaſons*, if at leaſt *triſles* may carry the name of reaſons. As for this reaſon it is not peruerſely propounded by Maiſter *Perkins*, but in ſuch ſort, as ſome of Maiſter *Biſhops* part haue propounded it vpon ſuppoſal of our aſſertion, that *faith can neuer be alone*. But as he propoundeth it himſelfe, the termes of his argument being declared, the anſwer will be plaine, and he ſhall be found a Sophiſter onely, and no ſoũd diſputer. It is therefore to be vnderſtood, that *remouing or ſeparating* of things one from the other, is either *reall* in the ſubiect, or *mentall* in the vnderſtanding. Reall ſeparation of *faith* and *charity* we wholy denie, ſo as that true faith can no where bee found, but it hath *charity* infallibly conioyned with it. *Separation mentall* in vnderſtanding and conſideration, is either *negatiue* or *priuatiue*. *Negatiue*, when in the vnderſtanding there is an affirming of one, and denying of another, and the one is conſidered as to be without the other: which vnderſtanding in things that cannot be really & indeed ſeparated in the ſubiect, is falſe vnderſtanding, and not to be admitted. *Separation priuatiue* in vnderſtanding is, whẽ of things that cannõt be ſeparated indeed, yet a man vnderſtandeth the one, and omitteth to vnderſtand the other: conſidereth the one, and conſidereth not the other. Thus though light and heate cannot be ſeparated in the fire, yet a man may conſider the light, and not conſider the heate: though in the reaſonable ſoule, *vnderſtanding*, *reaſon*, *memory*, and *will*, and in the ſenſitiue part the faculties of *ſeeing*, *hearing*, *ſmelling*, *&c.* cannot be remoued or ſeparated one from the other, yet a mã may cõceiue, or mind one of theſe, without hauing conſideration of the reſt. Now if *M. Biſhop* by *negatiue ſeparatiõ*, do remoue *hope* & *charity* frõ *faith*, ſo as that his meaning is, that if faith alone do iuſtifie, thẽ though there be neither *hope* nor *charity*

yet faith will neuertheleſſe iuſtifie, his *maior* propoſition is falſe. For though it be true, that *the totall cauſe of any thing being in act, the effect muſt needs follow*, yet from the total cauſe can we not ſeparate thoſe things, together with which it hath in nature his exiſtēce and being, and without which it cannot be in act for the producing of the effect, though they conferre nothing thereto; becauſe that is to denie the being of it, and the deſtroying of the cauſe. But if his meaning be, that if *faith alone* do iuſtifie, then though we conſider not *hope* & *charitie* as concurring therewith, yet it ſelfe doth iuſtifie, we graunt his *maior* propoſition for true, but his *minor* is not true. We ſay, that *faith conſidered without hope and charity* (that is, hope and charity not conſidered with it) *doth iuſtifie*. Then ſaith he, *a man may be iuſtified without any hope of heauen, and without any loue towards God, or eſtimation of his honour*. True ſay I, if his meaning be, that *the hope of heauen, or loue of God, and eſtimation of his honour* be excepted only *priuatiuely*, and onely not conſidered with faith as cauſes of iuſtification. But if his meaning bee, as it is, that a man then is iuſtified without hauing any hope of heauen, or loue towards God, or eſtimation of his honour, hee plaieth the part onely of a brabler, inferring a reall ſeparation of thoſe things in the ſubiect, which the argument ſuppoſeth onely reſpectiuely ſeparated in the vnderſtanding. Here is then no preſumption in the *Proteſtants iuſtification*, but *M. Biſhop* is much to be condemned of *preſumption*, that hauing left his head at Rome, and broken his braines in contending againſt the Ieſuites, he would notwithſtanding take vpon him to be a writer, and do it ſo vainely and idlely as he hath done. According to that that hath bene ſaid, *M. Perkins* anſwereth, that though faith be neuer ſubſiſting without hope and loue and other graces of God, yet in regard of the act of iuſtification, it is alone without them all, euen as the eye in regard of ſubſtance and being is neuer alone, yet in reſpect of ſeeing it is alone: for it is the eye onely that doth ſee. *Here is* (ſaith *M. Biſhop*) *a worthie peece of Philoſophy, that the eye alone doth ſee*. Why I pray, what is the default? Marry *the eye is but the inſtrument of ſeeing*, ſaith hee, *the ſoule being the principall cauſe of ſight, as it is of all other actions of life, ſenſe and reaſon*. But did not your ſenſe and reaſon ſerue you to vnderſtand that *M. Perkins* meant accordingly, that the eye alone doth ſee, that is, that the eye alone of all the mēbers & parts, is the

inſtrument

inſtrument of ſeeing, and proportionably that faith alone of al the vertues and graces of the ſoule, is the inſtrument of iuſtification? As the ſoule then ſeeth only by the eie, ſo the ſoule ſpiritually receiueth iuſtification by faith alone. If his head had ſtood the right way, he might very eaſily haue conceiued that *M. Perkins* in ſaying that *the eie alone doth ſee*, did not meane to exclude the ſoule that ſeeth by the eie, but only all other parts of the body from being conſorted with the eie in the ſoules imploiment and ſeruice for that vſe. And that that *M. Perkins* ſaith therin, is directly to the purpoſe, becauſe the queſtion is not here of the whole cauſe of iuſtification, but onely of the inſtrumental cauſe. Of the efficient & final cauſe of iuſtification there is no queſtiō, which is, God in Ieſus Chriſt, for our ſaluation and the glory of his name. The materiall cauſe we ſay and haue proued to be the merite and obedience of Chriſt. The formall cauſe is Gods imputation, apprehēded and receiued by vs. The inſtrument of this apprehenſion we ſay is fath alone, which is the very point here diſputed of. But here he will returne the ſimilitude vpon vs; *the eie cannot ſee without the head, becauſe it receiueth influence from the head before it can ſee* Be it ſo: no more can faith iuſtifie without Chriſt, Without God, whoſe ordinance & gift it is, of whom it hath it force and power, being by him as peculiarly appointed to iuſtifie, as the eie is to ſee. The eie is a natural inſtrumēt, receiuing his influence frō the head wherof it is naturally a member and part: but faith is an inſtrument ſupernatural; not any naturall part or power and faculty of the ſoule, but the inſtinct and worke of God, and therefore receiueth all the force and influence that it hath, from the ſpirit of Ieſus Chriſt. But he maketh other application hereof. *So cannot faith iuſtifie without charity, becauſe it neceſſarily receiueth ſpirit of life frō it, before it can do any thing acceptable in Gods ſight.* So then charity is *the head*, and faith *the eie*, and we muſt needs take it ſo, becauſe *M. Biſhop* hath told vs that it is ſo. But if it be ſo, then it ſhould be as ſtrange a matter to ſee faith without charity, as it is to ſee an eie without an head; as ſtrange that charity being extinguiſhed and gone, there ſhould remaine a faith whereby to beleeue; as that the head being dead, there ſhould remaine an eie whereby to ſee. But that that giueth influence and life to an other thing, muſt needs haue a priority to that that receiueth it. charity hath no priority to faith, but charity

it

it selfe is obtained by faith. For [a] *faith is the beginning to bee ioyned vnto God.* [b] *Faith is first giuen, by which the rest is obtained;* [c] *which being first giuen vnrequested, at the request thereof all other benefits or good things doe ensue and follow.* [d] *Faith is the roote and foundation of good works: from which vnlesse they grow, they are not to be called good; euen* [e] *that roote of righteousnes wherby the Lord imputeth righteousnes without works, which receiuing the dew or shoure sticketh in the ground that thence the branches may spring which bring forth the fruits of good works.* Faith is [f] *the nest* wherin we are to lay our works, that we may hatch them vnto God. Faith is [g] *the mother of a good will, and iust and righteous conuersation. Our faith in Christ is* [h] *Christ in vs, and* [i] *that heauenly Sun is either impaired or increased vnto me,* saith *Ambrose, according to my faith.* In a word, *S. Austin* telleth vs, that [k] *faith is the soule of our soule,* & what is that to say, but the life of all our life? It is faith then, and not charity, that giueth influence to al the rest, euen to charity it selfe; as faith increaseth, so other graces are increased; as faith decreaseth, so other graces decrease: the life of faith is our life: the strength of faith is our strength: if our faith be weake, there is nothing else wherby we can be strong. Therfore *M. Bishop* goeth much awry (yet no otherwise then hee is wont to do) in assigning to charity to giue the spirit of life and influence to faith, when as it is by faith that wee [m] receiue the spirit which is the author of al spiritual life and grace, & on which all our state dependeth towards God.

a Eccles. 25. 33.

b Aug. de praedest. sanct. cap. 7. Fides prima datur, ex qua impetrentur cetera.

c Prosp. de voc. gent. lib. 1 cap. 6. Cum fides data fuerit non petita ipsius iam petitionibus bona cetera consequuntur.

d Aug. in Psal. 31. Laudo superaedificationem boni operis, sed agnosco fidei fundamentum: fidei radicem. Nec loquor illa (opera) appellanda esse quae non de radice bona procedunt.

e Origen. in Ro. cap. 4. Fides tanquam radix imbre suscepto haeret in animae solo vt surgant rami qui fructus operum ferant: illa fides radix iustitiae qua Deus accepto fert iustificationem siue operibus.

f Aug. in Psa. 83. Fides nidus est pullorum: virorum in hoc nido operare operatus.

g Prosp. de voc. gen. l. 1. c. 8. Fides bonae voluntatis & iustae actionis est genitrix.

h Aug. in Ps. 130 Christus in corde vestro fides est.

i Ambr. in Luc. l. 1. c. 21. Mihi sol ille caelestis non fide vel munitur vel augetur.

k Aug. in Ioan. tract. 49. Vnde mors in animâ? Quia fides nõ est. Ergo anima tua viuit fides est. l Cyprian. ad Quirinum. lib. 3. cap. 43. Tantũ possumus quantum credimus. n. Galat. 3 14.

## 24 W. BISHOP.

*The fourth reason, if faith alone do iustifie, then faith alone wil saue, but it wil not saue,* ergo. M. Perkins *first denieth the proposition, & saith* That it may iustifie, and yet not saue: because more is required to saluation then to iustification. *Which is false: for put the case that an innocent babe die shortly after his baptisme wherin he was iustified, shal he not be saued for want of any thing? I hope you will say yes: euen so any man that is iustified, if he depart in that state, no man makes doubt of his saluation, therfore this first shift was very friuolous. Which* M. Per. *perceiuing flies to a second, that for faith alone we shall also be saued, & that good works shal not be regarded at the day of our iudgement. Then must those words of the holy Ghost so often repeated in the Scriptures, be razed out of the text.* God at that time wil rẽder vnto euery man according to his works. *But of this more amply in the question of merits.*



m Aug. de praedest. sanct. cap. 7. Fides prima datur, ex qua impetrentur cetera.

R. Abbot.

Tertullian rightly saith,[a] *the saluation of man is the one title of all the benefites of God, forgiuenesse of sinnes being put in the first place.* If *saluation* be the whole, and iustification but a part, then more is required to saluation then to iustification, because more is required to the whole then to a part. Vnder saluation we comprehend both iustification and sanctification in this world, & life and blisse eternall in the world to come. The first act of our saluation is our iustification; but God hauing by iustification reconciled vs vnto him, goeth forward by sanctification [b] *to make vs meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light.* To iustification belongeth only faith; to sanctification all other vertues and graces, wherein consisteth that [c] *holinesse without which no man shall see the Lord.* His exception as touching infants dying after baptisme, is very idle. They are not onely iustified by forgiuenesse of sinnes, but also sanctified by the spirit of grace; neither is there any man iustified to the title of eternall life, but the same is together also sanctified to the possession thereof, and therfore hath more to saluation then onely iustification. But as touching the very point, his *minor* proposition is false. We say, that we are saued also by faith onely, according to that that before I alledged out of *Origen*, that [d] *for faith only Christ said to the woman, Thy faith hath saued thee. Hath saued thee*, saith he, as a thing already done, according to the vsuall phrase of the Scripture in that behalf. For so it is said of *Zaccheus*, [e] *This day saluation is come to this house.* So saith the Apostle, [f] *He hath saued vs, and called vs with a holy calling;* [g] *of his owne mercy he hath saued vs.* The reason whereof is, because in iustification, as I haue said, our saluation is begun, and in that wee are iustified wee are saued, Christ therin being giuen vs, and in him the interest and title of eternall life thenceforth by that right onely to be continued and performed vnto vs. Being then iustified by faith alone, wee are saued by faith alone, the gift of sanctification to holinesse and good works being necessarily cõsequent, nor as by vertue wherof we are to be saued, whom the Scripture pronounceth to be already saued, but as the processe of Gods worke, for accomplishment of that saluation, whereto in iustification we are begotten, and in way of inheritãce intitled by faith alone. We are saued by faith alone, saith

a Tertul. de pœnit. *Horum bonorum vnus est titulus salus hominis criminum pristinorum abolitione præmissa.*

b Col. 1. 12.

c Heb. 12. 14.

d Origen in Ro. cap. 3. sup. sect. 21

e Luke 19. 9.

f 2. Tim. 1. 9.

g Tit. 3. 5.

*M. Perkins*, because faith alone is the instrument whereby we apprehend Christ, who onely is our saluation. Where obserue, gentle Reader, what *M. Bishop* maketh of that speech, that *for faith alone we are saued, and that good works shall not be regarded at the day of our iudgement. O impudence.* Where doth *M. Perkins* say, that *good works shall not be regarded at the day of our iudgement?* What? a Doctor of diuinitie to lie so wilfully to lie? What is this but meere villanie, to abuse his Reader, not being carefull haply to looke into *M. Perkins* booke, but taking it vpon his word. But if thou haue *M. Perkins* booke, I pray thee to looke to the obiections and answers set downe in the end of this question of Iustification, which *M. Bishop* hath vnhonestly left out; and there in the answer to the fift Obiection, thou shalt find these words, *In equitie the last iudgement is to proceed by works, because they are the first meanes to make triall of euery mans cause, and serue fit ioo declare whom God hath iustified in this life.* By which words thou maiest esteme how little faith or credite is to be yeelded to this wretched man, who doubteth not heere with manifest falshoode, to affirme that *M. Perkins* saith, that *good workes shall not be regarded at the daie of our iudgement.* And by the same words the solution is plaine to the words which he alledgeth; for God shall *render* to the faithfull *according to their works*, because good workes are the proper markes whereby God will take knowledge of them that are iustified and saued onely by faith in Christ. For whom God hath iustified and saued, vpon them he setteth the seale and marke of his Spirit, working in them another nature, and *creating them in Christ Iesus vnto good works*, whereby he will thenceforth know them to belong to him, and thereby at that day will put difference betwixt them and other men. So that to speak of *saluation* in that sort as we commonly vnderstand it, for the finall blisse and saluation that we expect in heauen, faith alone in it selfe is not sufficient to saluation, because though we bee interested to it onely by faith, yet somewhat else is required to prepare vs and fit vs to bee partakers thereof. And to speake of saluation in grosse, faith *alone* excludeth not sanctification and good workes, but includeth them, as a part of that saluation whereof we are made partakers by faith alone, so that rightly are we said to be saued by faith alone, because nothing else doth giue vs any title, and it selfe alone doth giue vnto vs all other things.

g Rom. 2.

h Matt. 16. 27.

i Ephes. 2. 10.

things that are necessarie to saluation.

W. Bishop.

5. *Reason. There bee many other vertues, vnto which iustification and saluation are ascribed in Gods word: therefore faith alone sufficeth not. The Antecedent is prooued, first of feare is it said:* He that is without feare, cannot be iustified. *We are saued by hope.* Vnlesse you do penance, you shall all in like sort perish. *We are translated from death to life, (that is iustified) because we loue the brethren. Againe of Baptisme:* Vnlesse you bee borne againe of water and the holy Ghost, you cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen. *Lastly wee must haue a resolute purpose to amend our euill liues:* For we are buried together with Christ by baptisme into death, that as Christ is risen from the dead, &c. so we may also walke in newnesse of life. *To all these and many such like places of holy Scripture, it pleased* M. Perkins *to make answer in that one:* You are saued by hope; *to wit, that* Pauls *meaning is only, that we haue not as yet saluatiõ in possession, but must waite patiently for it, vntill the time of our full deliuerance; this is all. Now whether that patient expectation, which is not hope, but issueth out of hope, of eternall saluation, or hope it selfe bee any cause of saluation, he saith neither yea nor nay, & leaues you to thinke as it seemeth best vnto your selfe.* S. Paul *then affirming it to bee a cause of saluation, it is best to beleeue him: and so neither to exclude hope or charitie, or any of the foresaid vertues from the worke of iustification, hauing so good warrant as the word of God, for the confirmation of it.*

Eccles. 1. Rom. 8. Lu. 13. 1. Ioh. 3.

Rom. 6.

Rom. 8.

R. Abbot.

Iustification before God is no where in all the Scripture ascribed to any other vertue saue onelie faith: the promise of saluation is sometimes adioined to other vertues, as fruits & marks of them whom God hath saued, but neuer as causes thereof, as in the question of merits shall appeare. We may well thinke that *M. Bishop* was heere shrewdly put to his shifts, that in all the Scripture could find no plainer proofes to serue his turne. *M. Perkins* propounded but one place for them; hee thought himselfe to lay on loade, and yet cannot bring vs any thing whereby it is said that we are iustified, but onely faith. His first place is taken out of an Apocryphall Scrip-

Scripture, and yet such as it is, it saith nothing for him. First his trā-slation is false; for the words as their owne *Arias Montanus* translateth them, are these, [a] *A man given to pitch hanger cannot bee iustified*; that is, cannot bee acquitted of doing amisse, cannot be cleared of committing offence, because as S. *Iames* saith, [b] *the wrath of man doth not accomplish the righteousnesse of God*, euen in like sort as the same Ecclesiasticus after saith, [c] *he that sweareth vainely shall not be iustified*: and againe, [d] *a victualler shall not bee iustified of sinne*. For so is the Scripture wont continually to vse the word of *iustifying* for acquitting, clearing, discharging, holding or pronouncing guiltlesse and innocent, approuing, allowing, acknowledging for iust, and such like, as where it is said, [e] *woe vnto them which iustifie the wicked for reward*, [f] *shall I iustifie the false ballance?* [g] *he willing to iustifie himselfe*, &c. Secondly therefore if the words be taken as he translateth them, *he that is without feare cannot be iustified*, he is as farre off from his purpose. For the words import to the same effect, that he that is without feare shall not be found innocent, he shall not be found free from great sinne, because the want of feare maketh a man bold to runne into all sinne: but a verie sensuall man is he that would go about hereby to proue, that a man is iustified by *faith*. Againe he bringeth the words of Christ, [h] *Vnlesse ye repent* (*doe penance*, saith he, according to their foolerie) *ye shall all likewise perish*. And what of this? *Ergo* forsooth a man must bee iustified by doing of penance. Yea? and is doing of penance a matter of iustification now? But *Ambrose* sayeth, that the Apostle calleth them [i] *the blessed, of whom God hath decreed, that without labour or any obseruation they are iustified with God onely by faith: there being required of them no labour of penance but onely to beleeue*. Why then doth *Master Bishop* tell vs, that we are iustified by *doing of penance*? Our Sauiour spake nothing there, in their behalfe, and verie absurdly doe they apply that that was meant of inward conuersion and repentance, to outward and ceremoniall obseruation of *doing penance*. As for repentance, it setteth foorth the subiect capable of iustification by faith, but is it selfe onely an acknowledgment of sinne, no healing of our wound. The feeling of paine and sickenesse, causeth a man to seeke for remedie, but it is no remedie it selfe. Hunger and thirst maketh a man to desire and seeke for foode, but a man is not fed by being hungrie.

a Eccles. 1. 27. Ἀνὴρ προσκείμενος ἁμαρτίᾳ οὐ μὴ δικαιωθῇ· οὐδὲ μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἡ ὀργὴ ἀνδρὸς κατευθυνθήσεται. Non poterit iracundus vir iustificari.

b Iam. 1. 20.

c Eccles. 23. 11.

d Cap. 26. 30.

e Esa. 5. 23.

f Mich. 6. 11.

g Luk. 10. 29.

h Luk. 13. 3.

i Ambros. in Ro. cap. 4. Beatos dicit de quibus hoc sanxit Deus, vt sine labore & vlla obseruatione fola fide iustificentur apud Deum. Et paulò post. Nulla ab his requisita penitentiæ opera, iustificantem vocante Deo.

By

By repentance we know our selues, we feel our sickenesse, we hunger and thirst after grace, but the hand which we stretch foorth to receiue it, is faith onely, without which repentance is nothing but darknesse and despaire. As for vs, we hold it a very mad conclusion to say *Except ye repent ye shall perish*, therefore we are iustified by repentance: We rather see by repentance, that we haue nothing in our selues whereby to be iustified, and therefore learne to relie wholy vpon Christ, that we may be iustified by faith in him. The next place that he alleageth is a most notable falsification. *We are translated*, saith he, *from death to life, because we loue the brethren*; whereas the words of *S. Iohn* are, [k] *We know that we are translated from death to life, because we loue the brethren*, making our loue of the brethren a signe whereby we know that we are translated frō death to life, not the cause for which we are translated frō death to life. And in this sort doth S. *Austin* expound it, *We know. What do we know? That we haue passed from death to life. Whereby do we know it? Because we loue the brethren.* Which is very plaine also by comparing the tēses in which the Apostle expresseth the one & the other. For he nameth our translating from death to life in the [m] preter perfect tense, as a thing before done, but our loue towards the brethren in the [n] present tense, as a thing which now we do. *We know that we haue passed, or God hath translated vs from death to life, because we loue the brethren.* But our louing the brethren now cannot be the cause of that that God hath done before. It is therefore a token onely whereby we are to know what God hath done. And to take it as *M. Bishops* doth, is the doctrine of *Pelagius*, that *the grace of God is giuen vnto vs according to our merits*, as before is shewed. The next place is of *Baptisme*, as he saith, [o] *Except a man be borne againe of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God.* But we can hardly yeeld that this place is precisely to be vnderstood of baptisme; because it is not true, that except a man bee baptized, he shall not enter into the kingdome of God, but it is infallibly true which Christ saith, that except a man be borne againe of water and of the holy ghost, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God. Verie wel is it obserued by *Bernard*, that our Sauiour saith, [p] *He that beleeueth and is baptized, shall be saued; but doth not say, he that is not baptized, but onely, he that beleeueth not shall be damned.* The thiefe was not baptized vpon the crosse, but yet Christ saith,

k 1 Joh. 3. 14.

l *Aug. in epist. 1 Ioan. tract. 5.* Nos scimus. Quid nos scimus? Quia trāsiimus de morte ad vitam. Vnde scimus? Quia diligimus fratres.

m ὅτι μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου, &c. μεταβεβήκαμεν.

n μεταβεβήκαμεν.

o Joh. 3. 5.

p *Bernard. Epist. 77. Videne forsè ob hoc saluator cùm diceret, Qui crediderit & baptizatus fuerit, saluus erit, cauèt & vigilanter nō repetierit. Qui verò baptizatus non fuerit, sed tantum, qui verò, inquit, non crediderit condemnabitur.*

q This

*This day shalt thou bee with me in paradise*, Valentinian the Emperour was not baptized, and yet *Ambrose* saith, [q] *because he desired it, he receiued it*. S. *Austin* acknowledgeth as touching them that are of elder yeares and do beleeue, [r] that *baptisme is inuisibly fulfilled in them, when not any contempt of religion, but a point of necessity excludeth the mysterie of it*. Which dispensation we cannot conceiue what warrant hee had to giue to elder yeares that should not make the same good to infants also, when the faith of the parents by which they are interested to baptisme, craueth the same for them, & only by preuention inuincible they are depriued of their desire, it being deemed a thing [s] *belonging to the mercifulnes of God, that grace shold yeeld, that the faith of others should be auailable for thē to whom years yet do not yeeld to beleeue themselues*. But hereby it appeareth, that that speech of Christ is not simply to bee vnderstood of baptisme, because then baptisme should bee simply necessary to saluation both in old and yong. Yet admitting it to be meant of baptisme, we say his argument is very vaine; and to say, *baptisme is necessarie to saluation, therefore we are not iustified by faith alone*, is all one as if he should say, It is necessary to saluation to bee iustified by faith alone, therfore we are not iustified by faith alone. For baptisme, as I said before, is [u] *the seale of the righteousnesse of faith*, wherein God setteth before vs, and by which he giueth and sealeth and assureth vnto vs the washing away of our sins, and the accepting of vs for iust and righteous by the merit and bloudshedding of Iesus Christ onely by faith in him. It is not then [x] *the washing away of the filth of the flesh*, that is, the outward ceremony, for which baptisme is necessary to saluation, but the spirituall grace, which is iustification by faith alone. This God offereth in baptisme, and wee by faith receiue the same, but wee shall do amisse to put baptisme it selfe in place of that that is offred thereby. Wee eate the meate out of the dishes and vessels wherein it is set before vs, but it is absurd thereupon to say, that we are fed by the dishes also, and not onely by the meate. It is Christ onely who in the word and Sacraments is set forth vnto vs to be our righteousnesse, and by faith onely, we therin receiue him to be our righteousnesse and euerlasting life; but absurd it is hereupon to say, that the Sacraments thēselues are things wherein our righteousnesse doth consist. Now therefore except a man in baptisme be borne againe, becomming a member of Christ

q Luk 23.43. r Ambr. de obit. Valentin. Cui quia propositū accepit.

s Aug. de bapt. cont. Donat. lib. 4. cap. 22. Tunc impletur inuisibiliter ea̅ mysterii baptismi non contẽptus religionis sed articulus necessitatis excludit.

t Bernard. epist. 77. Dignum est et ad Dei spectat benignitatem, vt quibus fidem et as denegat propriam, gratia prodisse concedat alienam.

u Rom. 4. 11.

x 1. Pet. 3. 21.

and the child of God through forgiueneſſe of ſinnes onely by faith in him, by vertue thereof receiuing the ſpirit of adoption, & being thereby quickned to newneſſe of life to walke therein, hee cannot as Chriſt ſaith, enter into the kingdome of God. And hereby it appeareth, that his other place as touching walking in newneſſe of life is impertinently alledged, the words importing no more then what we teach, that *newneſſe of life* is alwaies and neceſſarily a conſequent fruite of iuſtification, though neuer any precedent cauſe thereof. But the place of greateſt moment for their part, was that that *M. Perkins* propounded for his obiectiõ. *We are ſaued by hope.* As touching this place *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *M. Perkins* ſaith *neither yea nor nay, but leaues the reader to thinke as it ſeemeth beſt vnto himſelfe, whether hope be any cauſe of ſaluatiõ*, and yet *M. Perkins* words are plainely theſe, *We are not ſaued by hope becauſe it is any cauſe of our ſaluation.* The meaning of *S. Paul* as he declareth is this, *We are ſaued by hope*; that is, we haue our ſaluation in hope, but not yet in act: we enioy it in expectation, but not yet in poſſeſſion. In which ſort he ſaith in another place, that *y being iuſtified by the grace of God wee are made heires as touching hope of eternall life.* We haue not yet the fruition of eternal life, but yet in hope we are inheritors therof. And hence did *S. Auſtin* take the ground of that exception which many times he vſeth by diſtinction of that that we are *in hope*, and that that we are *indeed* or *in reall being*. Whereof hee ſpeaketh directly to declare the meaning of theſe words of the Apoſtle, z *We haue now the firſt fruits of the ſpirit, whence we are* (rēipſa) *indeed the ſonnes of God, but for the reſt, as* (ſpe) *in hope wee are ſaued, as in hope we are renewed, ſo are wee alſo the ſonnes of God: but becauſe* (reipſa) *indeed we are not yet ſaued, therefore we are not yet fully renewed: wee are not yet the ſonnes of God, but the children of this world.* Againe he ſaith, a *A man wholly in hope, and partly alſo in act or indeed is renewed in ſpirituall regeneration.* Of the Church being *without ſpot or wrinkle*; b *Then ſhall that be performed indeed, to which now by profiting we walke in hope.* Thus of Gods *raiſing vs vp together with Chriſt, and ſetting vs together with him in heauenly places*, c *He hath not yet done it really, but in hope.* d *Really we are yet the children of wrath*, ſaith he, *but in hope we are not ſo.* e *Reioyce that in body thou art redeemed, not yet indeed, or in real effect, but in hope we are out of doubt.* By al which it is plaine, that the Apoſtle named not hope as a cauſe of the ſaluation

y Tit. 3.7.

z *Aug. de pec. mer. & remiſſ. l. 2. c. 8. Primitias ſpe nunc habemus, vnde iam filij Dei re ipſa facti ſumus: in cæteris vero ſpe ſicut ſalus, ſicut innouati, ita & filij Dei: re autem ipſa quia nondum ſalui, ideò nondum plenè innouati, nondum etiam filij Dei ſed filij ſeculi.*

a *Ibid. c. 10. Homo totus in ſpe iam, et iam in re ex parte regeneratione ſpirituali renouatus.*

b *Epiſt. 57. Tunc perficietur in re, quò nunc proficiendo ambulatur in ſpe.*

c *De bapt. cont. Donat. lib. 1. c. 4. Nondum in re ſed in ſpe.*

d *In Pſal. 37 Re ſumus adhuc filij ire, ſpe non ſumus.*

e *Ibid. Gaudete redemptum corpore, ſed nondum re ſpe ſecurus eſto.*

uation that we hope for, but only to signifie the not having as yet really of the thing whereof the hope we haue embraced. And it hath no sense, that hope should be made a cause of the thing hoped for, because the very name of hope importeth some former ground or cause from whence we conceiue our hope, & by vertue whereof we expect that which we hope for, and doe not therefore hope to obtaine it, because we hope. Thus *M. Bishop* hath neither *S. Paul* nor any other testimony of Scripture, whereby to giue warrant, that either hope or any other vertue, hath any part in the worke of iustification, but only faith. As touching the nature of *hope* [a] before hath beene spoken, and it hath beene shewed, that as the Scripture vnderstandeth it, it is nothing else but a patient and constant expectation of that which we by faith in the promise of God doe assuredly beleeue shall come vnto vs.

[a] *Cap. 3. sect. 20.*

## 26. W. Bishop.

*To these authorities & reasons, taken out of the holy Scripture, let vs ioine here some testimonies out of the ancient Church reserving the rest vnto that place, wherein* Master Perkins *citeth some for him, the most ancient and most valiant Martyr Saint* Ignatius, *of our iustification writeth thus:* The beginning of life is faith, but the end of it is charie, but both vnited and ioined together, do make the man of God perfect. *Epist. ad Philip.*

Clement *Patriarch of Alexandria saith:* Faith goeth before, but feare doth build, and charity bringeth to perfection. *Lib. 2. Strom.*

*Saint* Iohn Chrisostome *Patriarch of Constantinople, hath these words:* Least the faithful should trust that by faith alone they might be saued he disputeth of the punishment of euill men, and so doth he both exhort the Infidels to faith and the faithull to liue well. *Hom. 70. in Mat.*

S. Augustine *crieth out as it were to our Protestants, & saith,* Heare ô foolish heretik, and enemy to the true faith. Good works, which (that they may be done, are by grace prepared, and not of the merits of free will) we condemne not: because by them, or such like, men of God haue been iustified, are iustified and shall be iustified. *Lib. 3. Hypogno.*

*And,* Now let vs see that which is to be shaken out of the hearts of the faithfull: *Least by euill security they lose their saluation,* if they shall thinke faith alone to be sufficient to obtaine it. *De fide & oper. cap. 14.*

*Now the doctrine which* M. Perkins *teacheth is cleane contrarie,*

*For* (*saith he*) A sinner is iustified by faith alone, *that is, nothing that man can doe by nature or grace, concurreth thereto as any kind of cause but faith alone. Farther he saieth,* that faith it selfe is no principall, but rather an instrumentall cause, whereby we apprehend and apply Christ & his righteousnesse for our iustification. *So that in fine we haue, that faith so much by them magnified & called the only and whole cause of our iustification, is in the end become no true cause at all, but a bare condition, without which we cannot be iustified. If it be an instrumentall cause, let him then declare what is the principall cause, whose instrument faith is? and chuse whether he had leuther to haue charity, or the soule of man without any helpe of grace.*

*Conditio sine qua non.*

R. ABBOT.

Of his fiue proofs there is but only one that maketh any mention of iustification by works. The two first were surely put in but only to fil vp a roome; for there is not so much as any shew of any thing against vs. For although we defend, that a man is iustified by faith only, yet do we not make faith onely the full perfection of a iustified man. In the naturall body the heart onely is the seate and fountaine of life, and yet a man consisteth not only of a heart, nor is a perfect man by hauing a heart, but many other members and parts are required, some for substance, some for ornament, which make vp the perfection of a man, whereof if any be wanting, it is an imperfection, so that [a] *if but one ey-brow be shauen,* as *S. Austine* saith, *though in a maner nothing be taken from the body, yet it causeth a great blemish vnto it.* Euen so is it in the iustified man; faith onely is the seat and fountaine of spiritual life, because as the quickning faculty & power of the liuing soule dwelleth in the heart, so Christ who is our life dwelleth in our faith, or *in our hearts by faith*; but yet we consist not spiritually of faith onely, but many other vertues and graces are required to make vp the perfection of a Christian man, to which as to the other members from the heart, so from faith life is imparted and communicated, that in them wee may be aliue to God. Thus then *Ignatius* saith not purposely of iustification, but by occasion of commending faith and loue, that [b] *faith is the beginning of life, &c.* Which maketh for vs altogether against him. For if faith be the beginning of life, then by faith we first

[a] *Aug. de ciuit. Dei lib. 11. ca. 22. Si vnum radatur supercilium, quàm propemodum nihil corpori & quam multum detrahitur pulchritudini?*

[b] *Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes.* for which M. Bishop following his Master Bellarmine, misquoteth, *Ep. ad Philippenses.*

first liue. By faith therfore we are iustified; for to be iustified, as *M. Bishop* confessed in the former section, is to be *translated from death*. Now as naturall birth draweth not only guilt but also corruption, as hath bene before shewed, so faith wherein is our new birth, giueth not onely forgiuenesse of sinnes to iustification, but also sanctification to holinesse and newnesse of life, the summe whereof is *charitie*, because *charitie* is the *epitome* and briefe of the whole law, and herein further is accomplished our perfection towards God; so as that *faith and loue vnited and ioyned together, do make perfect the man of God*. The place of *Clemens Alexandrinus* is the same, and needeth no further answer. With *Chrysostome* wee say, that faith alone sufficeth not absolutely, though faith alone suffice to iustification. Charitie and good workes are necessarie to the perfection of a iustified man, but he is not by them made a iustified man. Therfore the same *Chrysostome* saith of *Abraham*, [c] *That a man that is without workes should be saued by faith, it should be no strange matter, but that he that hath made himselfe renowmed by his good works should yet not be iustified thereby but by faith, this is wonderfull, and doth greatly set forth the power of faith.* *S. Austin*, in the place by him alleged, if it were *S. Austin*, auoucheth good workes to iustifie them that are iustified, that is, to approue them iust; but condemneth the auouching of any workes whereby to obtaine iustification, and purposely in that place disputeth against it. [d] *By workes no flesh shall be iustified in the sight of God, because the righteousnesse of God by his preuenting mercy, through the faith of Iesus Christ, is apparent vpon all that do beleeue. Therefore the Apostle saith, we are iustified freely by the grace of God. Put not thine owne workes before it, nor glorie thereof, because by workes no flesh shall be iustified before him.* If no workes go before iustification, then *M. Bishops* cause, as too weake, must go to the wals, because then we cannot be said to be iustified by workes; for being iustified before, we cannot be sayd properly to be iustified by workes that follow after, and if neither by workes before nor after, then not at all. It followeth therefore, that when *S. Austine* saith in that place, that *men of God are iustified by good workes*, he must needs meane as *Thomas Aquinas* saith *S. Iames* doth, [e] *quantum ad manifestationem iustitiæ, by way of manifesting and declaring that a man is iustified*, so as that contrarie to *M. Bishops* assertion, they are only signes and tokens of a iustified man, not any causes

c *Chrysost. ad Rom. hom. 8. Fide saluari eum qui opera non habet, nihil fortasse fuerit insolentius: verò qui recte factus se consiciuum fecerit, non ex ipsis sed ex fide iustum fieri, hoc scilicet admirabile est & quod maximè fidei potentiam manifestat.*

d *Agust. Hypognost. lib. 3. Ex operibus no iustificabitur omnis caro coram illo quia iustitia Dei preuenit misericordia per fidem Iesu apparuit super omnes qui crediderunt. Ideò & subiungens inquit, Iustificati gratis per gratiã Dei. Noli ei præponere opera propria, we ex eisdẽ gloriare, quia ex operibus non &c.*

e *Thom. Aquin. in Gal. cap. 3. lect. 4.*

causes of iustification. Therefore S. *Austin* saith againe anon after, [f] *Iustification hath beene giuen, is giuen, and shall be giuen to them that beleeue, by the faith of Iesus Christ.* Now that which he saith in the words cited by *M. Bishop*, he saith it not as to the Protestant, but to the Pelagian heretike the brother of the Papist, for affirming good workes of mans *free will* before the iustifying grace of God, for which the iustifying grace of God is bestowed vpō him. Which opinion S. *Austin* hauing cōfuted, bringeth in the heretike obiecting thus, [g] *Then wilt say, Dost thou then condēne the good works of free will, in that thou saiest that righteousnesse is not due by workes? If so, why then doth the Apostle command vs to abound in good works?* To which he answereth: [h] *Hearken thou foolish heretike and enemy of the true faith. We condemne not the good works of free will, which that they may be done, are prepared by the preuenting of grace vpon no merite of free will, and the same preuenting grace causing, directing & effecting that they do abound in free will, because by such men of God haue bin, are, & shalbee iustified in Christ. But by diuine authority wee condemne the workes of free will which are put before grace, and are extolled for vs by these as it were merits to be iustified in Christ.* Where verie plainly by the name of the *workes of free will*, hee excludeth all workes before the grace of iustification, from being any causes thereof, & only in men of God, who are first iustified that they may be men of God, affirmeth a iustification by works in that sense as S. *Iames* speaketh thereof, which, as I haue said, is nothing else but a declaration and testimonie of their beeing formerly iustified by the faith of Iesus Christ. In what sense he speaketh of *free will*, it hath beene shewed before in the question of that matter, and that hee acknowledgeth no *free will* to righteousnesse, but onely that that wee doe, which is made free by the grace of God. To the last place of S. *Austine* we willinglie subscribe, condemning them [i] *who thinke that onely faith is sufficient to obtaine saluation, and do neglect to liue well, and by good workes to keepe the way of God*; which last words seruing plainely to open S. *Austins* meaning, *M. Bishop* very honestly hath left out. We teach no such faith as S. *Austin* there speaketh of. We teach onely such a faith as iustifieth it selfe alone, but is neuer found alone in the iustified man, neuer but accompanied with holinesse and care of godly life, and therefore condemne those as spirits of Satan, which teach a faith sufficient to obtaine saluation without any regard of liuing

f. *Aug. vt supr. Iustificatio per fidem Iesu Christi data est, datur datur credentibus.*

g *Ibid. Ergo inquis damnas opera libri arbitrij bona, quæ dicis in iustitiam ex operibus non debere? &c.*

h *Audi hæretice fluxe & inimice fidei ver. tatis. Opera libri arbitrij bona quæ vt fiant præparantur per gratiæ præuentum nullo libi arbitrij merito et is so ficiente. gubernante & perficiente vt abundent in libero arbitrio non damnamus, quæ ex his homines Dei iustificati sunt, iustificantur & iustificabuntur in Christo. Damnamus vero authoritate diuina opera liberi arbitrij quæ gratiæ præponuntur, & ex illi tanquam meritis in Christo iustificari extollantur.*

i *De fide & oper. cap. 14. Si adeam (salutem) obtinendam sufficere solā fidem putauerint; bonā autem vitam & bonis operibus viam Dei tenere neglexerint.*

liuing well. The ſumme of our doctrine *S. Auſtin* himſelfe ſetteth downe in the very ſame Chapter, that good workes [k] *follow a man being iuſtified, but are not precedent to iuſtification.* Now therefore in all theſe ſpeeches there is hitherto nothing to croſſe that which *M. Perkins* hath affirmed, that nothing that man can doe either by nature or grace concurreth to the act of iuſtification as any cauſe, but faith alone. Of works of nature there is leſſe queſtiō, but of works of grace, of workes of beleeuers the Apoſtle ſpecially determineth the queſtion, that we are not iuſtified thereby, as ſhall appeare. *M. Perkins* further ſaith, that *faith is but the inſtrument all cauſe of iuſtification*, as whereby we apprehend Chriſt to be *our righteouſneſſe*, and neuer doth any of vs make faith *the onely and whole cauſe of iuſtification* in any other ſenſe. We make not the verie act of faith any part of our righteouſneſſe, but only the merit and obedience of Chriſt, apprehended and receiued by faith. But by this meanes *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that faith is *become no true cauſe at all, but a bare conditiō without which we cannot be iuſtified.* But that is but his ſhallow and idle conceipt; for the neceſſarie inſtrument, eſpecially the liuely inſtrument, is amongſt the nūber of true cauſes, not being *cauſa ſine qua non, a cauſe without which the thing is not done*, but a cauſe whereby it is done. *Cauſa ſine qua non* is termed *cauſa ſtolida & otioſa, a fooliſh & idle cauſe*, becauſe it is only preſent in the action, & doth nothing therein. It is not ſo with faith, but as the eie is an actiue inſtrument for ſeeing, and the ear for hearing, &c. ſo is faith alſo for iuſtifying; and *M. Biſhops* head was ſcant wiſe, to make a principal inſtrument a fooliſh and idle cauſe. But hee asketh then, *whoſe inſtrument faith is?* and maketh his diuiſion, that either it muſt be *charity, or the ſoule of man without any help of grace.* We anſwer him, that it is the inſtrument of the ſoule wrought therein by grace, beeing [l] *the gift of God*, and [m] *the firſt gift*, as before we haue heard out of *Auſtin, whereby we obtaine the reſt*, and therefore whereby we obtaine charity alſo, ſo that his diuiſion goeth lame, and neither is faith the inſtrument of charitie, nor yet of the ſoule without grace, but of the ſoule therein & thereby endued with the grace of God.

[k] *Ibid. Sequuntur iuſtificatum: non precedunt iuſtificandum.*

[l] Epheſ. 2. 8.

[m] *Aug. de prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 7.*

## W. BISHOP:

*But to come to his reaſons. The firſt is taken out of theſe words:* As *Moſes* lift vp the ſerpent in the deſart, ſo muſt the ſonne of man

bee lift vp, that whosoeuer beleeueth in him, shall not perish, but haue life euerlasting. *Tyne, if he liue accordingly, and as his faith teacheth him: but what is this to iustification by onely faith?* Marrie M. Perkins drawes it in after this fashion. *As nothing was required of them who were stung by serpents, but that they should looke vpon the brazen serpent: so nothing is required of a sinner, to deliuer him from sinne, but that he cast his eies off faith vpon Christs righteousnesse, and apply that to himselfe in particular. But this application of the similitude is onely mans foolish invention, without any ground in the text. Similitudes be not in all points alike, neither must bee stretched beyond the verie point wherein the similitude lieth, which in this matter is, that like as the Israelites in the wildernesse stung with serpents, were cured by looking vpō the brazen serpent: so men infected with sin, haue no other remedy, then to embrace the faith of Christ Iesus: All this we confesse, but to say that nothing else is necessary, that is quite besides the text, & as easily reiected by vs as it is by him obtruded without any authority or probability.*

R. Abbot.

Similitudes *M. Bishop* saith, must not be stretched *beyond the very point wherein the similitude lieth*, but Christ himselfe heere directeth vs to conceiue wherein the similitude lieth. Christ himselfe expresseth, that in their looking vpon the Serpent was figured *our beleeuing in him.* What shall we then conceiue, but as they only by looking were cured of the sting, so we only by beleeuing are cured of sinne. So *S. Austin* saith; [a] *As they that beheld that Serpent, were healed of the stinging of the Serpents, so they who by faith behold the death of Christ, are healed of the sting of sin.* And againe, *A Serpent is looked vnto that a Serpent may not preuaile, & a death is looked vnto that death may not preuaile.* In like sort doth *Chrysostome* expresse the similitude: [b] *There by bodily eies men receiued the health of the body; heere by spirituall eies they obtaine forgiuenesse of all their sinnes.* So saith *Cyril.* [c] *He is shewed (hereby) to be the giuer of eternall saluation to them that by true faith do looke vnto him.* [d] *He teacheth* (sayth *Theophylact*) *that sith the Iewes beholding the image of the brazen Serpent did escape death, much more we looking vnto him crucified and beleeuing shall escape the death of the soule.* Thus they simply tooke the words of Christ, and made the cure to consist as on the one side

a *Aug. in Ioan. tract. 12. Quomodo qui intuebantur serpentem illū sanabantur à morsibus serpentum. sic qui intuentur fide mortem Christi sanatur à morsibus peccatorum. Attenditur serpens vt nihil valeat serpens: attenditur mors vt nihil valeat mors.*

b *Chrysost. in Ioan. hom. 26. Illic corporeis oculis suspicientes corporis salutem: hic incorporeis peccatorum omnium remissionem consecuti sūt.*

c *Cyril. in Ioan. li. 2. cap. 20. Respicientibus in eum fide sincera diuinæ salutis largitor ostenditur.*

d *Theophyl. in Ioan. cap. 3. Multo magis ad crucifixum respicientes & credentes animæ mortem effugituros.*

in

in *looking*, so on the other side in *beleeuing*. *M. Bishop* saith, that the meaning is, *that men infected with sinne, haue no other remedy then to imbrace the faith of Christ Iesus.* Wel then: if no other remedy, then that is the only remedy. If that be the onely remedy, then for remedy there is nothing necessarie, but only that. And if any thing else be necessarie, then the cure is not performed by that, nor to be ascribed vnto it; for a cure cannot be said to be done by one thing, when that doth not cure without another. But as there to *looking*, so heere the cure is ascribed to *beleeuing*. It is therefore to be ascribed to nothing but faith onely. As for that which hee further requireth by his corrections & exceptions, it is but a part of the cure which is performed by faith onely. For whatsoeuer is necessary in vs to eternall life, followeth of true and liuely faith, and is ministred vnto vs in Christ Iesus, when by faith wee haue imbraced him. [e] *Our hearts are purified by faith*; [f] *by faith we receiue the promise of the spirit*, and [g] *the law of the spirit of life which is in Christ Iesus deliuereth vs from the law of sinne and of death*, that it may neither preuaile against vs to condemnation, nor any further reigne ouer vs in conuersation, which beeing the gift of God, is not to be alledged to impeach the free bestowing of the grace of God.

e Act. 15. 9.
f Gal. 3. 14.
g Rom. 8. 2.

28. W. BISHOP.

*His 2. reason is collected of exclusiue speeches (as he speaketh) vsed in Scriptures.* As wee are iustified freely, not of the law, not by the law, not of works, not of our selues, not of the works of the law, but by faith: all boasting excluded: only beleeue. *These distinctions, whereby workes and the law, are excluded in the worke of iustification, include thus much: that faith alone doth iustifie.*

Gal. 2. 16. Luk. 8. 50.

*It doth not so: for these exclusiue speeches do not exclude feare, hope, and charity, more then they exclude faith it selfe. Which may be called a work of the law, as well as any other vertue, being as much required by the law as any other. But S. Pauls meaning in these places is, to exclude all such workes, as either Iew or Gentile did, or could bragge of, as done of themselues, and so thought that by them, they deserued to bee made Christians. For he truly saith, that all were concluded in sinne, and needed the grace of God, which they were to receiue of his free mercy, through the merits of Christ, and not of any desart of their owne; And that*

*that to obtaine this grace through Christ, it was not needfull, nay rather hurtfull to obserue the ceremonies of* Moyses *law, as Circumcision, the obseruation of any of their feasts, or fasts, nor any such like worke of the law, which the Iewes reputed so necessary. Againe, that all mor all works of the Gentiles could not deserue this grace, which works not proceeding from charity, were nothing worth in Gods sight. And so all workes, both of Iew and Gentile, are excluded from beeing any meritorious cause of iustification, & consequently, all their boasting of their owne forces, their first iustification beeing freely bestowed vpon them. Yet all this notwithstanding, a certaine vertuous disposition is required in the Iew and Gentile, whereby his soule is prepared to receiue that great grace of iustification: that say we, is faith, feare, hope, loue, and repentance, that (say the Protestants) is faith onlie. Wherefore say wee, as the excluding of works, and boasting exclude not faith, no more do they exclude the rest, faith beeing as well our worke, and a worke of the law as any of the rest, and all the rest being of grace, as well as faith, and as far from boasting of, as faith it selfe. Now that out of* S. Luke, beleeue onely, *is nothing to the purpose. For hee was bid beleeue the raising of his daughter to life, and not that Christs righteousnesse was his: and faith alone may be a sufficient disposition to obtaine a myracle, but not to obtaine iustification, of which the question onely is.*

*Consider now good Reader, whether of our interpretations agree better with the circumstance of the text, and the iudgement of the ancient Fathers. The texts see thou in the Testament. Take for a taste, of the Fathers iudgement,* S. Augustines *exposition of those places of* S. Paul *of one of the chiefest of which, thus he speaketh:* Men not vnderstanding that which the Apostle saith, We esteeme a man to be iustified without the law, thought him to say that faith sufficed a man although he liued euill, and had no good workes: *which God forbid, that the vessell of election should thinke. And againe.*

*De gra. & lib. arb. cap. 7.*

*De prædest. sanct. cap. 7.*

Therefore the Apostle saith, that a man is iustified by faith, and not of workes, because faith is first giuen, and by it the rest (*which are properly called workes, and in which we liue iustly*) are by petition obtained.

*By which it is manifest, that* S. Paul *excluding the works of the law, and the workes done by our owne onelie forces, doth not meane to exclude good workes, which proceede from the helpe of Gods grace.*

R. Abbot.

R. ABBOT.

If iuſtification be affirmed of faith, & denied to all other things, it ſhould ſeeme likely that the meaning of the Scripture is, that by *faith onely* we are iuſtified. *M. Biſhop* anſwereth, that *thoſe excluſiue ſpeeches of the law, and works of the law, do no more exclude feare, hope, charity, then they exclude faith it ſelfe, becauſe it is a worke of the law as well as any other vertue.* But yet the Apoſtle teacheth vs, that the promiſe is [a] *therefore of faith, that it may be of grace*, and, [b] *if it be of grace, it is not of workes*, and therefore expreſſly ſeuereth *faith* from *workes*, as elſewhere he maketh a diſtinction betwixt [c] *the law of workes*, and *the law of faith*, ſo that *M. Biſhop* in confounding faith with the workes of the law, ſpeaketh flatly contrary to the Apoſtle. For the *faith of Chriſt*, though it be accidentally reduced to the law, yet is not originally intended in the law, becauſe Chriſt who is the obiect of our faith, is in order of nature conſequent to the law. For life is firſt propounded in the law; which when it cannot be obtained there, Chriſt is conſequently giuen and offered vnto vs, that we may haue life in him. But we further tell him as before, that we attribute not our iuſtification to faith for it ſelfe, or as it is an act or worke, as if it were any part of our iuſtice or righteouſneſſe, but as the heart giueth life to the body, not by the ſubſtance of it ſelfe, which is but fleſh as the reſt of the body is, but by the vitall and quickning power of the ſoule that is ſeated therein; & as the hand feedeth the body, not as being it ſelfe the foode of the body, but by receiuing and miniſtring vnto it the meat wherewith it is ſuſtained, euen ſo faith iuſtifieth and giueth life, by receiuing Chriſt to be our righteouſneſſe and life, in him [d] *receiuing forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, and inheritance amongſt them that are ſanctified* vnto eternal life. But *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that *the Apoſtles meaning in thoſe places is, to exclude all ſuch works as either Iew or Gentile did or could bragge of, as done of theſelues, & ſo thought that by them they had deſerued to be made Chriſtians.* A goodly toy. For ſooth after they had bene Chriſtians a long time, they began to diſpute & reaſō the matter, whether it were for the works that before they had don, that they were made chriſtiās? whether they had deſerued by their works to be made Chriſtians, [e] whē *they had their cōuerſatiō in the luſts of the fleſh, in fulfilling the wil of the fleſh & of the mind, walking according to the courſe of this world*

a Rom. 4. 16.
b Cap. 11. 6.
c Cap. 3. 27.
d Act. 26. 18.
e Ephe. 2. 3.

*and*

*and after the Prince that ruleth in the aire, the spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience*, as the Apostle describeth the condition both of Iewes and Gentils, before they were partakers of the grace of Christ. Were the Christians then of so slender vnderstanding as that they should make question of their deserts in that estate? Was that the thing so much laboured by the false Apostles, to perswade men that for their former deserts they were become Christians; and had the Apostle so much businesse to weane them, and withhold them from the conceipt and opinion of such deserts? What should a man spend time and labour to refute so ridiculous, so senslesse and absurd deuices? Who would thinke that *M. Bishop*, a Doctor of Diuinitie by title, should be so simple a man, as that his Master *Bellarmine* could gull him, and gudgeon him with so vain a tale? The matter is plaine. After that men had accepted the faith
f Act. 15 1. of Christ, and were become f *brethren and disciples*, there came vnto
g Ver. 2. them the false Apostles, and preached vnto them, g *Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saued.* They sought to perswade men, that to the faith of Christ they must adde the obseruation of *Moses* law. Heere was no question, whether by any deserts they were become Christians, but being now Christians, what it was wherein they should repose themselues for iustificatiō and saluation. The Galathians were amongst others intangled by
h Gal. 1. 9. those false Apostles, and hauing before h *receiued the Gospel, hauing*
i Cap. 4. 27. *bene baptized into Christ*, i *hauing receiued the spirit*, yea and k *hauing*
k Cap. 3. 2. *suffered many things for the Gospell*, yet were brought to the adioi-
l Ibid. Ver. 4. ning of circumcision and the law to the faith of Iesus Christ, to be iustified thereby. This the Apostle inueyeth against, and reducing the state of the question from the ceremonies of the law to the whole law, determineth not concerning the Popish first iustification, but concerning iustification wholy, concerning men beleeuing alreadie, and in the state of grace, that they must be
m Ro. 3. 20. 28. Gal. 3. 11. m *iustified by faith, and not by the workes of the law*, yea *without the workes of the*
n Gal. 2. 16. *law*; yea, and saith, n *we haue beleeued in Christ, that we might be iustified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law.* The Papist saith, we beleeue in Christ, that we may be iustified by the works of the law; but the Apostle saith, we beleeued in Christ, that we might be iustified by the faith of Iesus Christ, and not by the works of the law; & giueth a reason, why we that beleeue in Christ can-

cannot be iustified by the works of the law, [o] *because by the works of the law, no flesh shall be iustified.* And whereas the Papist againe saith that by Christ and by his grace we are enabled to fulfill the law to be iustified therby, the Apostle peremptorily denounceth, [p] *Ye are abolished from Christ; ye are fallen from grace whosoeuer are iustified by the law.* And that we may vnderstand what law he meaneth, *S. Hierome* hauing mentioned those words, that *by the workes of the law, no flesh shall be iustified,* saith thereof, [q] *Which that thou maiest not thinke to be spoken onely of the law of Moses* (that is, the ceremoniall law) *but of all the Commandements which are contained vnder the one name of the law, the same Apostle writeth, saying, I consent to the law* (*or delight in the law*) *of God, as touching the inner man.* But of that before in the third section. Hereby then it appeareth that being members of Christ, and baptized into him, our iustification still consisteth not in works, but onely in the faith of Iesus Christ. But *M. Bishop* by a new qualification, telleth vs, that *all works both of Iew and Gentile, are excluded from being any meritorious cause of iustification.* Not then from being any cause, but only from being any *meritorious cause.* For he hath [r] before told vs, that that *vertuous disposition* of which he here speaketh, is the cause of iustification. But if they be causes, how then is it true that he saith here, that *the first iustification is freely bestowed?* For [s] *freely*, as the Rhemists tel vs, is as much to say, as *for nothing*; and if it be bestowed for this vertuous dispositions sake, then it is not bestowed *for nothing*, but for hope, for charity, &c. Thus they turne and wind this way and that way, and can find nothing whereupon to stand. Saint *Austine* giueth it for a rule, that [t] *the grace of God shall not be grace in any sort, except it be free in euery respect.* And how is it *free in euery respect*, if our works of preparatiō or disposition be properly the causes for which it is bestowed vpon vs? and what is it but a mockery, to say that the Apostle so often absolutly determining against iustification by works, should meane notwithstanding that workes are the very causes of iustification, only that they are not meritorious causes? Yet we haue heard, how *Bellarmine* maketh them [u] *quodam modo, in some sort* meritorious also, and that their Schooles haue commonly receiued them so to be, so that in this respect also, they do but dally with the Apostle. But tell vs *M. Bishop*, are those *vertuous dispositions* of yours the workes of grace, or onely of *free will?*

If

o *Ibid.*

p Cap. 5. 4.

q *Hieron. ad Ctesiphont. Quod ne de lege Moysi tantum dictum putes, & non de omnibus mandatis quæ vno legis nomine continentur; idem Apostolus scribit, dicens, cōsentio legi, &c.*

r Sect. 21.

s *Rhem. Testam. explication of words in the end. Gratis.*

t *August. contr. Pelag. & Celest. l. 2. cap. 24. Non enim gratia Dei gratia erit vllo modo nisi fuerit gratuita omnimodo.*

u *De iustificat. lib. 2. cap. 17.*

If they be of grace, as you commonly foiſt in the name of grace in ſpeaking of them, what hindereth thē from being meritorious, ſeeing it is grace you ſay that addeth *merit* vnto *works*? If they be of *free will*, then *all works of our own forces* bee not excluded from iuſtification, which before you ſay the Apoſtle intendeth. If he ſay that *free will* is helped by grace, let him tell vs, what hee meaneth therein by *grace*, and we ſhall find him a meere Pelagian heretike, as before is ſaid. He goeth on further, and ſaith, that *as the excluding of woks and boaſting excludeth not faith, no more doth it exclude the reſt*. How ſo? Marry *faith is as well our worke, and a worke of the law as any of the reſt*. But that is falſe as we haue already ſeene; and again, faith with vs doth not iuſtifie as a work, as both faith, hope and charity doe with them, but only as the inſtrument of our iuſtification to be apprehended and applied thereby. *All the reſt*, ſaith he, *are of grace as well as faith*. But being before iuſtification, how ſhould they be of grace, ſeeing before iuſtification ther is no infuſed grace? and why are they not meritorious, as hath bin ſaid? Againe, he ſaith, that *the reſt are as farre from boaſting of as faith*. But therin he flatly contradicteth the Apoſtle, who affirmeth, that[x] *boaſting is not excluded by the law of works, but by the law of faith*. And the thing is plaine; for he hath ſomewhat to boaſt of, who doth any thing, for which the grace of God is beſtowed vpon him, but in faith there is nothing to boaſt of, becauſe the act of faith is, to beleeue that God doth al through Chriſt onely for his mercies ſake; it is it ſelfe wholy the gift of God and attributeth nothing to it ſelfe or to vs, but all wholly vnto God. But *M. Biſhop* cannot be ſaid to exclude boaſting, in as much as he muſt confeſſe, as hath been before ſaid, that his works of preparation are intrinſecally the works onely of *free will*, and doth make the *free will* of man in all the worke of iuſtification concurrent with the grace of God, yea ſo far as that man hath to glory, that by his free will the grace of God taketh his due effect, it being in his power either to accept, or refuſe the ſame. Whereas he excepteh againſt the place of *Luke*,[y] *onely beleeue*, as nothing to the purpoſe, he ſheweth that he hath not learned rightly to conceiue therof. Let *S. Auſtin* teach him, that[z] *al the miracles which Chriſt did corporally, do ſerue for our inſtruction, that we may receiue of him that that ſhall not paſſe away, nor go from vs in the end*: that *by theſe temporal things which were ſeen, he edified*

x Rom. 3. 27.

y Luk. 8. 50.

z *Aug. de verb. Dom. ſer. 18. Nouerimus omnia miracula quae corporaliter fecit valere ad admonitionem noſtram vt percipiamus ab eo quod non eſt tranſiturum neq; ſi ſine abitu ſunt: & poſt. Per iſta temporalia quae videbantur ædificati fidem ad illa quae non videbantur.*

*diſied and builded faith to the things which were not ſeen.* Chriſt therfore yeelding here to faith only a miracle for the recouery of bodily life, doth inſtruct vs, that to faith onely he alſo yeeldeth the work of his power, for the raiſing of vs vp to the ſpirituall life of grace. The man indeed was bid, as *M. Biſhop* ſaith, *to beleeue the raiſing of his daughter to life*, but therein he was bid alſo to beleeue, that it is Chriſt by whom we are ſpiritually raiſed vp from death to life, in being reconciled vnto God by the not imputing of our ſinnes, through the righteouſneſſe and merit of the ſame Ieſus Chriſt imputed vnto vs. He ſaith, that *faith might be ſufficient to obtaine a miracle*, but I anſwer him, that that miracle was a benefit importing a further benefit, and all the benefits of Chriſt are obtained in like ſort, ſo that our Sauiour Chriſt ſtill referring them that ſeeke vnto him to faith, for the obtaining of bodily health, doth alſo referre vs to faith, for the obtaining of ſoules health. Now how his interpretation heere deliuered agreeth with the text of Scripture, the Reader I hope can well conſider by that that hath beene ſaid. As for the places of *Auſtin*, if his ſight had not failed him, I ſuppoſe he would not haue alledged them, the one of them being nothing at all againſt vs, and the other directly againſt himſelfe. We ſay, [a] *God forbid* that *the Apoſtle ſhould thinke, that faith ſufficeth a man although he liue euill, and haue no good workes.* Nay, wee ſay further, God forbid that hee ſhould thinke that there is any true faith in them that liue euill, and haue no good workes. Wee haue often enough ſaid, that a true iuſtifying faith is neuer ſeparated from godly life, and that faith that is without good workes, is onelie called faith with men, but indeede and with God it is not ſo. In the other place Saint *Auſtine* bringeth in the Apoſtle, ſaying, [b] *that a man is iuſtified by faith, and not of works.* But how accordeth this with that that Maiſter *Biſhop* ſaith, that a man is iuſtified by his workes, as well as by his faith? *By faith and not by works*, ſaith Saint *Auſtine* out of the Apoſtle; *both by faith & works*, ſaith *M. Biſhop* out of his owne braines. *S. Auſtine* giueth the reaſo, [c] *Becauſe faith is firſt giuē by which the reſt are obtained, which are properly called works, in which a mā liueth righteouſly.* Wherby he importeth that faith is firſt giuen, that thereby we may be iuſtified, & thence follow good works, in which we liue well: according to his rules before deliuered: [d] *They follow a man being iuſtified, they go not before*

a *Aug. de grat. & lib. arbit. cap. 3.*

b *De prædeſt. ſanct. cap. 7.*

c *Ibid. Quia ipſa prima datur ex qua impetrentur cætera quæ propria opera nuncupantur in quibus iuſte viuitur.*

d *De fide et operib. cap. 14. Sequitur iuſtificatum non præcedunt iuſtificandum.*

e Epiſt. 120. cap. 30. Ex hoc incipiunt bona opera ex quo iuſtificamur, non quia præceſſerunt iuſtificantur.

*before to iuſtification:* e *then they begin when we are iuſtified, we are not iuſtified for them going before.* Then plainely it appeareth by *S. Auſtines* iudgement, that iuſtification is the beginning of good works; and if iuſtification be the beginning of good workes, then by no meanes can it be ſaid, that good workes are any cauſe of iuſtification. Hee excludeth not then good workes, which proceed from Gods grace, as *M. Biſhop* ſaith, but hee denieth that there are any good workes before iuſtification, becauſe hee knoweth no grace but iuſtifying grace, & therfore directly croſſeth *M. Biſhops* aſſertion of good workes before iuſtification, which are the cauſes for which we are iuſtified.

## 29. W. Bishop.

*Maiſter Perkins third argument.* Very reaſon may teach vs thus much: that no gift in man is apt as a ſpirituall hand, to receiue and apply Chriſt and his righteouſnes vnto a ſinner, ſauing faith: loue, hope feare, repentance, haue their ſeuerall vſes, but none of them ſerue for this end of apprehending, but faith onely.

Anſwer. *Mans reaſon is but a blinde miſtris in matters of faith, and hee that hath no better an inſtructor in ſuch high myſteries, muſt needs know little. But what if that alſo faile you in this point? then euery man cannot but ſee how naked you are of all kind of probability. I ſay then that reaſon rather teacheth the contrary. For in common ſence, no man apprehendeth and entreth into the poſſeſſion of any thing, by beleeuing that he hath it. For if a man ſhould beleeue that he is rich, of honour, wiſe, or vertuous: doth hee thereby become preſently ſuch a one? nothing leſſe. His faith and perſwaſion is no fit inſtrument to apply and draw theſe things to himſelfe, as all the world ſees. How then doth reaſon teach me, that by beleeuing Chriſts righteouſneſſe to be mine owne, I lay hand on it, and make it mine? Againe Chriſts righteouſneſſe (according to their owne opinion) is not receiued into vs at all, but is ours onely by Gods imputation: what neede we then faith, as a ſpirituall hand to receiue? If they ſay (as* M. Perkins *doth) that faith is as it were a condition required in vs, which when God ſeeth in vs, he preſently imputeth Chriſts righteouſneſſe to vs, and maketh it ours, then will I bee bold to ſay, that any other vertue is as proper as faith, to haue Chriſt applied vnto vs: there being no other aptneſſe requiſite in the condition it*

*ſelfe,*

*selfe, but onely the will and ordinance of God: then euery thing that it shall please him to appoint, is alike apt: and so* M. Perkins *had smal reason to say, that faith was the onely apt instrument to apply to vs Christs righteousnesse.*

*Moreouer, true diuine reason teacheth me, that both hope & charity, do much more apply vnto Christians all Christes merits, and make them ours, then faith: For what faith assureth me of in generall, that hope applieth vnto me in particular: by faith I beleeue Christ to be the Sauiour of all mankind: by hope I trust to be made partaker of that saluation in him. But charity doth yet giue me a greater confidence of saluation: for by the rule of true charity, as I dedicate and imploy my life, labours, and all that I haue to the seruice of God, so all that God hath is made mine, so farre foorth as it can be made mine, according vnto that sacred law of friendship,* Amicorum omnia sunt communia. *And therefore in true reason, neither by faith, nor any other vertues, wee take such hold on Christs merits, nor haue such interest in his inestimable treasures, as by charity: which* S. Augustine *vnderstood well, when he made it the modell, and measure of iustification: saying,* That Charity beginning, was Iustice beginning: Charity encreased, was Iustice encreased: great Charity, was great Iustice: and perfect Charity, was perfect Iustice. *De nat. & gra. cap. vlt.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins* alledgeth, that very reason may teach vs, that faith onely iustifieth, because there is no gift in man that hath the property of apprehending and receiuing, but faith onely. To this *M. Bishop* answereth, that *mans reason is a blind mistresse in matters of faith.* Wherein he saith truly, and indeede is the cause why he himselfe writeth so blindly as he doth, and measureth high mysteries by carnall and base conceipts. And surely it seemeth that his reason was very blinde, who gaue so blinde a reason against that which Maister *Perkins* saith, being spoken not out of the reason of man, but as the reason of a faithfull man, may esteeme by direction of the word of God. *No man entreth into the possession of any thing,* saith hee, *by beleeuing that he hath it; for if a man beleeue that he is rich, doth hee thereby become rich?* I answer him, no: but though a man by beleeuing himselfe to bee rich, doe not become rich, yet if to a poore beggar a great man say, If thou wilt take

my word, and referre thy selfe to me, and depend vpon my fauour and good will, I will make thee rich: doth he not by giuing credit to his word commit himselfe to him, entertaine his fauour, accept his offer, and become owner of that that is promised vnto him? What is it whereby we accept of promise, but onely beliefe? Now all that our question is of, consisteth of *promise*, & in al the benefits of God we are [a] *the children of promise*, [b] *heires by promise*, [c] *heires of promise*, expecting all things by the gracious promise of God; [d] *by promise to be partakers of the diuine nature*, [e] *the blessing by promise*, [f] *the spirit by promise*, [g] *the inheritance by promise*, [h] *life eternall by promise*, [i] *by promise a new heauen & a new earth, wherein righteousnesse dwelleth*, all which [k] *promises in Christ are, yea and in him Amen*, for his sake first made, and for his sake to be performed also. Now seeing God hath taught vs, that [l] *by faith we obtaine the promises*, that [m] *we receiue the promise of the spirit through faith*; that [n] *the promise* (of blessing *is giuen by the faith of Iesus Christ to them that beleeue*, that [o] *as we beleeue, so shall it be vnto vs*, that [p] *whatsoeuer we desire when we pray, if we beleeue that we shall haue it, it shall bee accordingly vnto vs*, why is it strange to *M. Bishop*, that in beleeuing according to the word and promise of God, to bee partakers of those things which he hath promised, we should bee said to become partakers thereof? In those mad presumptions fondly alledged by him, there is no beleeuing, because there is no ground whereupon to beleeue, but when God promiseth, and tieth the effect of his promise to the beleeuing of it, not to beleeue that in the beleeuing of it wee are parakers of that which we beleeue, is to make God a liar, and to frustrate that which he hath promised. Sith then God hath promised Christ vnto vs, to be [q] *our righteousnes*, and that [r] *by the faith of Iesus Christ*, that is, by beleeuing him to be that vnto vs which God hath promised, surely in beleeuing him to bee our righteousnesse he is our righteousnesse, and [s] *wee are made the righteousnesse of God in him*. And this is indeede not by receiuing Christs righteousnesse really into vs, but by hauing righteousnesse imputed vnto vs for his sake. For we receiue the righteousnesse of Christ euen as we receiue himselfe, who so becommeth ours, as that [t] *we abide in him and he in vs*; [u] *we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones*, we are really and truely by the power of his spirit, one with him and he with vs, and yet he is not personally & bodily brought

a Gal.4.28.
b Cap.3.29.
c Heb.6.17.
d 2.Pet.1.4.
e Gal.3.14.16.
f Ephe.1.13.
g Gal.3.18.
h Tit.1.2.
i 2.Pet.3.13.
k 2.Cor.1.20.
l Heb.11.33.
m Gal.3.14.
n Ibid.ver.22.
o Mat.8.13.
p Mar.11.24.
q Ierem.23.6.
r Rom.3.22.
s 2.Cor.5.21.
t Iohn 6.56.
u Ephe. 5.30.

vnto vs. Faith seeketh Christ, and findeth him, and holdeth him in the virgins wombe, in the manger, in the garden, vpon the crosse, in the graue, in his resurrection & ascension vnto heauen, and in his now sitting at the right hand of God to make intercession for vs. Euery where faith embraceth him, and in euery of these seeth him to be ours, as hauing vndertaken and atchiued all these things for our sakes. Euen so the righteousnesse & merit of Christ is spiritually, but really ours within and without, in spirit, & soule and body, to clense and sanctifie vs vnto God. But, saith he, *if it be ours by Gods imputation, what need we then faith, as a spirituall hand to receiue it?* A foolish and idle question; as if he should say, If I giue food to a hungry man, what need hath he either of a hand to take it, or a mouth to eate it? He himselfe saw that the answer is ready, euen the same that *Ambrose* deliuereth: [x] *God hath so decreed: it is thus appointed of God*; God requireth faith, to which he will impute the righteousnesse of Christ. Where we may wonder at the absurd boldnes of this blind baiard, who telleth vs hereupon, that *he will be bold to say, that any other vertue is as proper as faith, to haue Christ applied vnto vs.* What *M. Bishop*, will you be bold to say, that any other vertu is as proper to apply Christ vnto vs, as that which God himselfe hath appointed for that vse? Is not *the will and ordinance of God* sufficient to restraine your presumption & bouldnes, & to shut your mouth from rūning ouer in this sort? He saith, that *there is no other aptnesse requisit in the condition it self, but only the will and ordinance of God.* But shal we be so impious, as to think that the *wil & ordinãce of God* without cause appointeth one cõdition whẽ as wel it might appoint another, or apointeth any thing to be don which is not more fitly don that way that he appointeth, then any other way? The Apostle telleth vs, [y] *Therfore it is by faith, that it may be of grace*, importing that faith is appointed as the fittest meanes, wherby to set forth the grace of God. Again, he addeth for another reason, [z] *That the promise might be sure to all the seed.* For no other wise can we rest assured of the promise of God, but as it is of grace, who in our works can find nothing wherupõ to assure our selues. By faith therfore we beleeue it to be of grace, that with cõfortable assurãce we may firmly expect the blessing which God hath promised vnto vs. Another reasõ with *S. Paul*, why faith is specially apointed, is [a] *to exclude boasting.* So saith *Ambrose*, [b] *God hath made choise*

x *Ambros. in Rom. ca. 4. 16. Sic decretum a Deo hoc sanxit Deus. Et in 1. Cor. cap. 1. Hoc constitutum est, &c.*

y Rom. 4. 16.

z Ibid.

a Cap. 3. 27.

b *Ambros. in Psal. 43. Maluit Deus vt salus hominis fide poneretur quàm operibus, quæ efferetur, nequis gloriaretur in suis factis.*

*that saluation should be gotten rather by faith then by works, that no man should glory in his owne doings.* It is therefore for the speciall aptnesse of faith, that God hath appointed it to be the instrument for applying vnto vs the whole benefit of Christ. Yet *M. Bishop* telleth vs, that *true diuine reason teacheth him, that both hope and charity doe much more apply Christs merits vnto vs then faith doth.* But it is indeed a dreaming and vnreasonable fancy, and not any true diuine reason that hath taught him so. For whereas he saith, that *hope applieth in particular what faith beleeueth in general*, it hath been before shewed, that the office of true faith is to make this particular application. And indeed there can be no true hope in any man, where there is not first a faith to apply the benefit of Christ particularly to himselfe. For though I beleeue that Iesus is a Sauiour, yet what ground haue I thereby to hope for Saluation, vnlesse I beleeue that he hath saued me; that [c] *he hath loued me and giuen himselfe for me?* Surely vnlesse I beleeue for my selfe, I cannot hope for any thing for my selfe, saue onely at vncertaine aduenture, and without ground. Now *M. Bishops* hope being no other, how can he be said therby to apply that to himselfe, whereof hee is still to stand in feare whether it bee his or not? But to come neerer to the point, the question here is of applying the merits of Christs vnto vs. Now the merit of Christ is that that Christ hath already done for vs. But hope respecteth that onely that is futurely to be done. Hope therefore can in no sort be the instrument to apply vnto vs the merit of Christ. Neither can chatity serue vs for that vse, because I cannot presume of that that is anothers, vpon any conscience of my loue towards him, but vpon confidence onely of his loue towards me. Howsoeuer I seeme to imploy my self to the seruice of God, yet it giueth me nothing whereof to presume with him, vnlesse I beleeue that of his loue hee doth accept my seruice, and will reward the same. Bee it as Master *Bishop* saith, that *all things are common amongst friends*, but before we can build thereupon, wee must haue it resolued vnto vs, that God taketh vs for his friends, which can bee no otherwise but by faith onely, [d] *God hauing set forth Christ to bee an attonement* (to make vs friends with God) *through faith in his bloud.* Faith then must first apply vnto vs the merite of the bloud of Christ, before there can bee any friendshippe betwixt

c Gal. 2.20.

d Rom. 3.25.

betwixt God and vs. And although beeing now in friendſhip with Chriſt, our loue may giue vs encouragement & comfort, to make vſe to our ſelues of that that is his, yet it is not by our loue, that we take it to make vſe therof. For the act of loue is don only *extramittendo*, by iſſue and paſſage from vs to Chriſt, and therefore it muſt be ſomwhat elſe whereby we receiue and apply from Chriſt to vs. To be ſhort, wee wonder what application *M. Biſhop* can make by charity, who[e] plainly profeſſeth that he cannot tell whether he loue God or God loue him; who ſaith that hope and charity are ſeated in the darke corners of the will, and a man hath but onely coniectures, and a probable opinion of the being thereof in himſelſe. What ſhall he then make bold of in name of friendſhip with Chriſt, who knoweth not whether he be a friend to Chriſt, or Chriſt to him? As for the ſaying of *Auſtine*, why he alledgeth it I know not; vnleſſe it be that he were onely deſirous to ſay ſomewhat out of *Auſtine*. *S. Auſtin* noteth, that inherent iuſtice conſiſteth in charity, which is the ſumme of the law, which is the rule of iuſtice. According therefore to the meaſure of our charity greater or leſſe, ſo is the meaſure of our righteouſneſſe. We ſay the ſame, but what is this to ſhew that charity is the fitteſt inſtrument to apply vnto vs the merit of Chriſt? But that he may not dreame of iuſtification before God, by any perfection of charity here, let him remember what Saint *Auſtine* hath ſaid thereof, that[f] *perfect charity is in no man ſo long as he liueth here; that the leſneſſe thereof to that that it ought to be, is by reaſon of a default or corruption in vs, by reaſon whereof, no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified in the ſight of God.*

[e] Chap. 3. Sect. 6. & 11.

[f] *Aug. epiſt. 29. Supra. cap. 2. ſect. 8.*

## 30 W. BISHOP.

M. Perkins *fourth reaſon* is taken from the iudgment of the auncient Church: They are bleſſed, to whom without any labour or worke done, iniquites are remitted. So no workes or repentance is required of them, but onely that they beleeue. *To theſe and ſuch like words, I anſwer.*

*Ambroſ. in Rom. 4.*

*Firſt, that it is very vncertaine, whether theſe Commentaries be Saint* Ambroſes.

*Secondly, that ſtint Author excludeth not repentance, but onely the*

*workes of* Moſes *law, which the Iewes held to be neceſſary: as circumciſion, and ſuch like. See the place, and confer with it that which he hath written in the ſame worke, vpon the fourth to the Hebrewes, where he hath theſe words: Faith is a great thing, and without it, it is not poſſible to be ſaued, but faith alone doth not ſuffice: but it is neceſſary that faith worke by charity, and conuerſe worthy of God.*

*De verb. Ap. ſer. 40.* M. Perkins *next authority is gathered out of* S. Auſtine. There is one propitiation for all ſinners, to beleeue in Chriſt. *True, but where is it, that we neede nothing elſe, but to beleeue?*

*Leuit. li. 1. ca. 2.* 3. Heſichius *ſaith*, Grace which is of mercy, is apprehended by faith alone, & not of workes: that is, we do not merit by our workes done before grace, any thing at Gods hand, but of his mercy receiue both faith and iuſtification.

*Sup. Cat. ſer. 28.* 4. Bernard *hath*: Whoſoeuer thirſteth after righteouſneſſe, let him beleeue in thee: that being iuſtified by faith alone, he may haue peace with God.

Anſwer. *By faith alone, he excludeth all other meanes, that either Iew or Gentle required, but not charity, which his very words include: for how can we abhorre ſinne, and thirſt after iuſtice, without charity? and in the ſame worke he declareth plainly, that he comprehendeth alwaies charity, when he ſpeakes of a iuſtifying faith: ſaying,* A right faith doth not make a man righteous, if it worke not by charity. *And againe*: Neither works without faith, nor faith without works is ſufficient to make the ſoule righteous.

*Serm. 24.*

*Gal 3.* 5. *Chryſoſtome*, they ſaid, he who reſted on faith alone, was accurſed: but *Paul* ſheweth, that he is bleſſed who reſted on faith alone. *Anſwer. He ſpeakes of the Iewes who held Chriſtians accurſed, becauſe reſting on the faith in Chriſt, would not obſerue withall* Moſes *law: the Apoſtle contrariwiſe denounceth them accurſed, who would ioyne the ceremonies of* Moſes *law with chriſtian religion, and ſo faith alone there excludeth onely the old law, not the workes of charity:*

*Gal 5.*

*De Humil.* *ſo he mangleth pittifully a ſentence of* S. Baſils *ſaying*: Let man acknowledge himſelfe to want true iuſtice, and that he is iuſtified only by faith in Chriſt: *If a man know himſelf iuſtified by faith in Chriſt, how can he acknowledge that he wants true iuſtice? His words truly repeated are theſe*: Let man acknowledge that he is vnworthie of true iuſtice: and that his iuſtification comes not of his deſert, but of the meere mercy of God through Chriſt. *So that by faith alone*

Saint

*Saint* Baſil *treating of humility, excludes all merit of our owne, but no neceſſarie good diſpoſition, as you may ſee in his Sermon* de Fide, *where he proues by many texts of holy Scripture, that charity is as neceſſarie as faith.*

M. Perkins *laſt teſtimony is out of* Origen: Who proues (*as* M. *Perkins ſaid*) that only beleeuing without workes iuſtifieth, by the example of the Theeſe on the Croſſe, of whoſe good works there is no mention. Rom.

*Anſwer.* Origen *excludeth no good diſpoſition in vs to iuſtification, but faith, that a man may be ſaued, without doing outwardly any good workes, if hee want time and place: as the Theefe did, who preſently vpon his conuerſion was put to death, which is good Catholike doctrine: but that you may perceiue how neceſſarie the good diſpoſitions before mentioned, be to iuſtificatiõ, you ſhall find if you conſider wel all circumſtances, not one of them to haue been wanting in that good Theefes conuerſion. Firſt, that he ſtood in feare of Gods iuſt iudgement, appeares by theſe his words, to his fellow,* Doeſt thou not feare God, &c. *He had hope to be ſaued by Chriſt, out of which he ſaide:* O Lord remember me, when thou commeſt into thy Kingdome: *By both which ſpeeches is ſhewed alſo his faith both in God, that he is the gouernor and iuſt iudge of the world, and in Chriſt, that he was the Redeemer of mankind. His repentance and confeſſion of his fault, is laid down in this:* And we truely ſuffer worthily: *His charity towards God & his neighbor, in reprehending his fellows blaſphemie, in defending Chriſts innocencie: and in the middeſt of his greateſt diſgraces, and raging enemies, to confeſſe him to be King of the world to come: out of all which we may gather alſo, that hee had a full purpoſe to amend his life, and to haue taken ſuch order for his recouerie, as it ſhould pleaſe Chriſt his Sauiour to appoint. So that he lacked not any one of theſe diſpoſitions, which the Catholike Church requires to iuſtification. Now that, that great Doctor* Origen *meant not to exclude any of theſe good qualities out of the company of faith, is apparant, by that which he hath written on the next Chapter: where he ſaith:* That faith cannot bee imputed to iuſtice, to ſuch as beleeue in Chriſt, vnleſſe they do withall put off the old man: *and a little before more plainly ſaying:* I thinke that faith is the firſt beginning of ſaluation, hope is proceeding in the building, but the top and perfection of the whole worke is charitie. Rom 4.

R. ABBOT.

To set downe the places alledged out of *Ambrose*, is sufficient to discouer the bad and euill conscience of *M. Bishop* in the answering of them, and to shew what a one hee is indeede in all the rest of his answers. First, [a] *they are iustified freelie*, saith he, *because working nothing, nor making any requitall, they are iustified by faith alone through the gift of God.* The second is this; [b] *They are blessed to whom without any labour or worke their iniquities are forgiuen and sinnes couered, no worke of penitencie being required of them, but onely to beleeue.* Thirdly, he saith, [c] *this is appointed of God, that he that beleeueth in Christ, shall be saued without workes freely, by faith alone, receiuing forgiuenesse of sinnes.* I pray thee now gentle Reader to marke well his answer to these allegations: First, he saith, that *it is very vncertaine whether these Commentaries be Ambroses.* It is true indeede, that some make question of the Prefaces that are inserted to the seuerall Epistles, but of the Commentaries themselues, saue onely vpon the epistle to the Hebrewes, I knowe no man that doubteth. Their [d] *Sixtus Senensis* reckoneth them for the workes of *Ambrose* for their part, and our [e] Centuristes for our part, and on both sides they are alwaies cited in his name. There is no doubt but they are the workes of a verie auncient writer, if they were not his, and therefore that can make little to acquit Master *Bishop* of crossing the ancient Church, vnlesse hee canne giue vs a better answer. But that we shall haue, namelie, *that that Authour excludeth not repentance, but onely the workes of* Moses *lawe, which the Iewes held to bee necessarie, as circumcision and such like.* Short and sweete! this hee hath told vs, and if wee will fare better, wee must take the paines to goe further. But let him remember that the point in question is of beeing iustified *by faith alone*, which Saint *Ambrose* there directly and fully affirmeth. *by faith onely, by faith onely, it is required onely to beleeue.* Now though the ceremoniall workes of *Moses* lawe be excluded from iustification, yet if we be iustified by any other workes, wee are not iustified *by faith onely or alone.* He excludeth not *repentance*, saith he, but let vs request him to turne vs these words into English: *Nulla ab his requisita penitentia opera nisi tantùm vt credant.* We take it to be this, *there being required of the no labour or worke of penitency or repentance, but onely to beleeue.*

a *Ambros. in Rō. cap. 3. Iustificati sunt gratis quia nihil operantes neque vicem reddentes sola fide iustificati sunt dono Dei.*

b *Ibid. cap. 4. Manifestè beati sunt quibus sine labore vel opere a liquo remittuntur iniquitates & peccata tegiuntur, nulla ab his requisita penitentie opera nisi tantùm vt credant.*

c *Idem. in 1. Cor. cap. 1. Hoc constitutum est à Deo vt qui credit in Christum saluus sit sine operis. sola fide gratu accipiens remissionem peccatorum.*

d *Sixt. Senens. biblioth. sanct. l. 4.*

e *Centur. Magdeburg. lib. 4. cap 10.*

*beleeue.* He meaneth indeed by *penitēcy*, that which publikely was don, & for which men were called *pœnitentes. penitents*, as afterward appeareth, but by excluding such works of penitency, it appeareth that it was not his meaning to exclude only circumcision & such other ceremonies of *Moses* law, and therefore that *M. Bishops* answer is a verie absurd and broken shifte. Marke the wordes gentle Reder *Working nothing, not making any requitall, without any labour or worke, no worke of penitency required, without workes, and freely, and by faith alone*, all sounding that [f] *a mans works do not iustifie him, but his prompt faith*, as the same *S. Ambrose* speaketh in another place. As for the words which he bringeth to crosse the other, they are no way contrarie to vs. We say as he saith, that *faith alone sufficeth not*, & yet we say as hee also saith, that *faith sufficeth to iustification*. For it is one thing to say what sufficeth to iustification, another thing to say what sufficeth to the perfection of a Christian and iustified man. The place alledged out of *Austine* inferreth our assertion, though it expresse it not. If it bee *our propitiation*, that is, our iustification, to beleeue in Christ, then onely to beleeue in Christ doth iustifie. If not, then it cannot be said to be our iustification to beleeue in Christ. For where the effect belongeth to many causes alike, there it cannot be singularly attributed to any one. His answer to the words of *Hesychius* is impertinent; for *Hesychius* beside that hee saith, that grace is not merited because it is of mercy, telleth vs also what it is whereby the same is apprehended, and that he saith is *faith alone*. [g] *Grace* which is of mercie is *apprehended by faith alone and not of works*. If grace be not apprehended by works as *Hesychius* saith, why doth *M. Bishop* tell vs that it is apprehended by works? If it be apprehended *by faith alone*, why doth hee tell vs that it is not apprehended by faith alone? Be it that our works before grace doe not merit our iustification, yet if by workes we bee iustified as well as by faith, then it is not true which this Father saith, that *the grace* of iustification is *apprehended by faith, and not by workes*. The words of Saint *Bernard* are plainely spoken of the imputed righteousnesse of Iesus Christ, by occasion of the Apostles words, that Christ is [h] *made vnto vs of God wisedome, righteousnesse, sanctification & redemption*. [i] *Righteousnesse*, saith he, *by forgiuenes of sinnes*, & for professing thereof faith of Christ, [k] *so sweete a sauour of thy righteousnes is every where spred abroad, as that thou art not only*

f *Ambros. in Psal. 43. Non facta sua vnumquenque iustificāt, sed fides prompta.*

g *Hesych. in Leuit. lib. 4. cap. 14. Gratis ex misericordia & compassione probatur, & sic comprehenditur solis non ex operibus.*

h 1. Cor. 1. 30.

i *Bernard. in Cant. ser. 22. Iustitia in absolutione peccatorum.*

k *Iustitie tue tanta vbique fragrantia spargitur, vt non solum in fluis sed & ipsa dicaris iustitia, et iustitia iustificans. Tam validus denique es ad iustificandum, quam multus ad ignoscendum. Quamobrem quisque pro peccatis compunctus erubescit et fatis iustitiam credat in te qui iustificas impium, & parum iustificatus se sibi parum debitor ad Deum.*

called

R. ABBOT.

To ſet downe the places alledged out of *Ambroſe*, is ſufficient to diſcouer the bad and euill conſcience of *M. Biſhop* in the anſweting of them, and to ſhew what a one hee is indeede in all the reſt of his anſwers. Firſt, [a] *they are iuſtified freelie*, ſaith he, *becauſe working nothing, nor making any requitall, they are iuſtified by faith alone through the gift of God.* The ſecond is this; [b] *They are bleſſed to whom without any labour or worke their iniquities are forgiuen and ſinnes couered, no worke of penitencie being required of them, but onely to beleeue.* Thirdly, he ſaith, [c] *this is appointed of God, that he that beleeueth in Chriſt, ſhall be ſaued without workes freely, by faith alone, receiuing forgiueneſſe of ſinnes.* I pray thee now gentle Reader to marke well his anſwer to theſe allegations: Firſt, he ſaith, that *it is very vncertaine whether theſe Commentaries be Ambroſes.* It is true indeede, that ſome make queſtion of the Prefaces that are inſerted to the ſeuerall Epiſtles, but of the Commentaries themſelues, ſaue onely vpon the epiſtle to the Hebrewes, I knowe no man that doubteth. Their [d] *Sixtus Senenſis* reckoneth them for the workes of *Ambroſe* for their part, and our [e] Centuriſtes for our part, and on both ſides they are alwaies cited in his name. There is no doubt but they are the workes of a verie auncient writer, if they were not his, and therefore that can make little to acquit Maſter *Biſhop* of croſſing the ancient Church, vnleſſe hee canne giue vs a better anſwer. But that we ſhall haue, namelie, *that that Authour excludeth not repentance, but onely the workes of* Moſes *lawe, which the Iewes held to bee neceſſarie, as circumciſion and ſuch like.* Short and ſweete: this hee hath told vs, and if wee will fare better, wee muſt take the paines to goe further. But let him remember that the point in queſtion is of beeing iuſtified *by faith alone*, which Saint *Ambroſe* there directly and fully affirmeth, *by faith onely, by faith onely, it is required onely to beleeue.* Now though the ceremoniall workes of *Moſes* law be excluded from iuſtification, yet if we be iuſtified by any other workes, wee are not iuſtified *by faith onely or alone.* He excludeth not *repentãce*, ſaith he, but let vs requeſt him to turne vs theſe words into Engliſh: *Nulla ab his requiſita pœnitentia opera niſi tantùm vt credant.* We take it to be this, *there being required of thẽ no labour or worke of penitency or repentance, but onely to beleeue.*

a *Ambroſ. in Rõ. cap. 3. Iuſtificati ſunt gratis quia nihil operantes neque vicem reddentes ſola fide iuſtificati ſunt dono Dei.*

b *Ibid. cap. 4. Manifeſtè beati ſunt quibus ſine labore vel opere a liquo remittuntur iniquitates & peccata tegũntur, nulla ab his requiſita pœnitentiæ opera niſi tantùm vt credant.*

c *Idem in 1. Cor. cap. 1. Hoc conſtitutum eſt à Deo vt qui credit in Chriſtum ſalus ſit ſine operc, ſola fide gratis accipiens remiſſionem peccatorum.*

d *Sixt. Senenſ. biblioth. ſanct. l. 4.*

e *Centur. Magdeburg. lib. 4. cap. 10.*

*beleeue*. He meaneth indeed by *penitēcy*, that which publikely was don, & for which men were called *pœnitentes*. *penitents*, as afterward appeareth, but by excluding ſuch works of penitency, it appeareth that it was not his meaning to exclude only circumciſion & ſuch other ceremonies of *Moſes* law, and therefore that *M. Biſhops* anſwer is a verie abſurd and broken ſhift. Marke the wordes gentle Reder *Working nothing, not making any requitall, without any labour or worke, no worke of penitency required, without workes, and freely, and by faith alone*, all ſounding that [f] *a mans works do not iuſtifie him, but his prompt faith*, as the ſame *S. Ambroſe* ſpeaketh in another place. As for the words which he bringeth to croſſe the other, they are no way contrarie to vs. We ſay as he ſaith, that *faith alone ſufficeth not*, & yet we ſay as hee alſo ſaith, that *faith ſufficeth to iuſtification*. For it is one thing to ſay what ſufficeth to iuſtification, another thing to ſay what ſufficeth to the perfection of a Chriſtian and iuſtified man. The place alledged out of *Auſtine* inferreth our aſſertion, though it expreſſe it not. If it bee *our propitiation*, that is, our iuſtification, to beleeue in Chriſt, then onely to beleeue in Chriſt doth iuſtifie. If not, then it cannot be ſaid to be our iuſtification to beleeue in Chriſt. For where the effect belongeth to many cauſes alike, there it cannot be ſingularly attributed to any one. His anſwer to the words of *Heſychius* is impertinent; for *Heſychius* beſide that hee ſaith, that grace is not merited becauſe it is of mercy, telleth vs alſo what it is whereby the ſame is apprehended, and that he ſaith is *faith alone*. [g] *Grace* which is of mercie is *apprehended by faith alone and not of works*. If grace be not apprehended by works as *Heſychius* ſaith, why doth *M. Biſhop* tell vs that it is apprehended by works? If it be apprehended *by faith alone*, why doth hee tell vs that it is not apprehended by faith alone? Be it that our works before grace doe not merit our iuſtification, yet if by workes we bee iuſtified as well as by faith, then it is not true which this Father ſaith, that *the grace* of iuſtification is *apprehended by faith, and not by workes*. The words of Saint *Bernard* are plainely ſpoken of the imputed righteouſneſſe of Ieſus Chriſt, by occaſion of the Apoſtles words, that Chriſt is [h] *made vnto vs of God wiſedome, righteouſneſſe, ſanctification & redemption*. [i] *Righteouſneſſe*, ſaith he, *by forgiuenes of ſinnes*, & for proſecuting thereof ſaith of Chriſt, [k] *ſo ſweete a fauour of thy righteouſnes is euery where ſpred abroad, as that thou art not only*

f *Ambroſ. in Pſal. 43. Non facta ſua vnumquenque iuſtificāt, ſed fides prompta.*

g *Heſych. in Leuit. lib. 4. cap. 14. Gratia ex miſericordia & compaſſione præbetur, & fide comprehenditur ſola, non ex operibus.*

h 1. Cor. 1. 30.

i *Bernard. in Cant. ſer. 22. Iuſtitia in abſolutione peccatorum.*

k *Iuſtitiæ tuæ tanta vbique fragrantia ſpargitur, vt non ſolum iuſtus ſed & ipſa diuinarum iuſtitia, et iuſtitia iuſtificans. Tam validus denique es ad iuſtificandum, quam multus ad ignoſcendum. Quamobrem quiſque pro peccatis compunctus eſurit et ſitit iuſtitiam credat in te qui iuſtificas impium, & ſolam iuſtificatus per fidem pacem habebit ad Deum.*

called

*called righteous, but alſo righteouſneſſe it ſelfe, and a iuſtifying righteouſneſſe. As ſtrong thou art to iuſtifie, as thou art ready to forgiue. Whoſoeuer therefore beeing pricked with his ſinnes hungreth and thirſteth after righteouſneſſe, let him beleeue in thee who iuſtifieſt the vngodly, and beeing iuſtified by faith only he ſhall haue peace with God.* M. Biſhop telleth vs, that *S. Bernard* by *faith alone excluded all other meanes that either Iew or Gentile required, but not charitie.* Vaine man, what had *S. Bernard* heere to doe either with Iewes or Gentiles? He ſpake to Chriſtian and faithfull brethren, to whom he had no occaſion to giue any caueat either againſt Iewes or Gentiles, but inſtructeth them what to do being pricked and greeued with ſinne, euen *to hunger and thirſt after righteouſneſſe*, not meaning by *righteouſneſſe* inherent righteouſneſſe, as *M. Biſhop* doth, but that *righteouſnes* which conſiſteth as he had before expounded it, in *the forgiueneſſe of ſins.* Therefore he teacheth to beleeue in Chriſt, who is our righteouſneſſe, [l] *a righteouſneſſe*, as hee ſpeaketh againe, *that forgiueth ſinnes*; the forme of which righteouſneſſe hee expreſſeth thus; [m] *Remember not the offences of my youth and my ignorances, and I am righteous or iuſt.* Thus *S. Bernard* ſaith, that *a man is iuſtified by faith alone*, and ſhall we be ſo mad as to thinke, that in ſaying *a man is iuſtified by faith alone*, his meaning was as *M. Biſhop* affirmeth, that a man is iuſtified by faith and charitie, that is to ſay, not iuſtified by faith alone? And did *S. Bernard* think that a man hath charitie before he haue charitie? For ſeeing as *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, the gift of charity is infuſed and powred into vs in iuſtification, ſurely to ſay that by charitie a man is iuſtified, is to ſay, that by charitie the gift of charitie is powred into him. Which if it be abſurd, then let him be content that *S. Bernards* meaning be, as indeed it is, that a man is iuſtified by faith alone, & let him take charitie for a gift of the iuſtified, & not for any fore-running cauſe of iuſtification. Now that the righteouſnes there ſpoken of is not meant of inherent righteouſneſſe it is very plain, in that *S. Bernard* in the words following treateth ſeuerally therof vnder the name of ſanctificatiõ. His counter-places are impertinent. What *S. Bernard* therein ſaith, we ſay: [n] *A mans beleeuing aright, except it worke by loue, doth not ſet him right or ſtraight*; and againe, [o] *Neither faith without workes, nor workes without faith, doe ſuffice to the rectitude or ſtraightneſſe of the minde.* True it is, as I haue often ſaid, that to the full rectifying and perfecting

l Iuſtitia donans delicta. ſub finem.

m Delicta iuuentutis meæ & ignorantias meas ne memineris & iuſtus ſum.

n *In Cant. ſer. 24. Non facit hom nẽ rectum fides etiam recta quæ non operatur ex dilectione*

o *Nec fides ſine operibus nec opera ſine fide ſufficiunt ad animi rectitudinem.*

perfecting of a man, belongeth not onely iuſtification by the forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, but alſo ſanctification to charitie and good workes; but what doth this hinder, but that notwithſtanding both the worke of iuſtification and the obtaining alſo of ſanctification, may be performed by faith alone? *Chryſoſtomes* words are, [p] *They ſayd he who reſted on faith alone is accurſed; but Paul ſaith, that he is bleſſed that reſteth vpon faith alone.* *M. Biſhops* anſwer, that *faith alone* there excludeth onely the *ceremonies of Moſes law*, is alreadie ſhewed to be vaine. But here it further appeareth, in that *Chryſoſtome* noteth, that the Apoſtle maketh ſpeciall choice of *Abraham*, who was ſo long before the Law, for an example of being iuſtified without workes, and that [q] *when as he abounded in good workes.* For if he in that caſe were not iuſtified by his workes, but by his faith, then it is manifeſt that not onely the ceremoniall workes of *Moſes* law, but all other workes are excepted from that iuſtification that is deſcribed to be by faith alone. We are to be iuſtified as *Abraham* was. *Abraham* though he abounded in good workes, yet was not iuſtified thereby. Therefore we alſo though we haue good workes, yet are not iuſtified thereby, but by faith alone. The ſentence of *Baſil* he ſaith is pitifully mangled by *M. Perkins*, when as by himſelfe it is altogether marred. *His words*, ſaith he, *truly repeated are theſe; Let no man acknowledge, &c.* putting in a ſentence of his owne making vnder the name of *Baſils words truely repeated.* What a ſhameleſſe man is he, thus to mocke his Reader, thus groſly and palpably to forge a matter, and yet to pretend truth? *Baſil* hauing mentioned the words of *S. Paul*, that [r] *Chriſt is made vnto vs of God wiſdome, righteouſneſſe, ſanctification and redemption*, ſaith hereupon thus: [s] *for that is perfect and full of reioycing in God, when a man is not liſted vp becauſe of his own righteouſnes, but knoweth that he himſelfe is deſtitute of true righteouſnes, and is iuſtified by faith onely which is in Chriſt.* Thus he ſpake to a Chriſtian auditorie, and inſtructed them to acknowledge themſelues to be void, wanting, deſtitute of true righteouſnes, & to be iuſtified only by faith in Chriſt. *M Biſhop* ſaith, that *he excludes all merits of our owne, but no neceſſary good diſpoſition*; but he ſhould remēber, I ſay; that *Baſil* ſpake to them that were paſt *diſpoſitions and preparations*, it being a Sermon, not *ad Catechumenos*, ſuch as were yet to be baptized, but *ad fideles, to the faithfull*, as they were tearmed after baptiſme, and them

p *Chryſoſt. ad Gal. 2. 3. Illi dicebant. quis ſola fide naſcitur execrabilis eſt. hic contra demonſtrat qui ſola fide naſcitur eum ineredibilem eſſe.*

q *Ibid. Abrahā produxit in medium, declarans hunc quoque ſic iuſtificatum. Quos ſi is ante gratiam ex fide iuſtificatus eſt, idq; operibus bonis floreret, multo magis vos. Et in Ep. ad Rom. hom. 8. ſupra. ſect. 26.*

r *1. Cor. 1. 30.*

s *Baſil. ſer. de humilit.* Ἀ'υτη γὰρ ἡ τελεία καὶ ὁλόκληρος καυχησις ἐστὶ τὸ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ μὴτε ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τῇ ἰδίᾳ πεποιθέναι, ἀλλ' ἐγνωκέναι ἑαυτὸν διὰ πίστεως ἀληθῶς, πένητα εἶναι καὶ μετατρεῖς χρὶ, τὸν δικαιοῦντα.

*Latinè apud Bellarm. de Iuſtif. lib. 1. cap. 25. Hæc eſt perfecta & integra gloriatio in Deo, quando neque ob iuſtitiam ſuam quis ſe iactat, ſed nouit quidem ſe ipſum veræ iuſtitiæ indigum, ſolæ autem fide in Chriſtum iuſtificatum.*

them doth he teach to acknowledge themselues to be iustified by faith alone. But whosoeuer they had bene, how crossely doth *M. Bishops* bad disposition carry him to *Basils* words? *Basil* saith: *Let a man acknowledge himselfe destitute of true righteousnesse, and to be iustified onely by faith in Christ.* *M. Bishop* saith, a man is not destitute of true righteousnesse, but hath vertuous good dispositions and preparations, by which he is to be iustified, and not by faith alone. But no maruell that they crosse others, who are so tangled with the truth, as that they know not how to speake, but to crosse themselues, still blowing both hot and cold; *freely*, and yet for workes; *for nothing*, and yet for somthing; no *merit*, and yet *in some sort* merit; *of meere mercie*, and yet somewhat to moue God beside his mercie. But to giue some colour to that that he saith, he telleth vs, that *Basil* in his *Sermon de Fide proueth by many texts of Scripture, that charitie is as necessarie as faith* Be it so, yet he doth not say, that we are iustified by charity. We say, as he there saith, that [f] *loue is the badge & cognizance of Christian men*; much commended vnto vs by our Sauior, as a marke whereby he will haue vs to be knowne to be his disciples. We say further, that it is as necessarie as faith, to the full perfection of a Christian man, and yet we say it hath nothing to do in the act of iustification. To his question as touching the words alledged, *If a man know himselfe iustified by faith in Christ, how can he acknowledge, that he wants true iustice?* I answer him, that a man acknowledgeth himselfe to want in himselfe true inherent iustice, confessing himselfe to be sinnefull and corrupt, when yet he wanteth not that iustice or righteousnesse of which *S. Paule* saith: [t] *To him that worketh not* (that is, [u] *who hath no confidence by workes*) *but beleeueth in him that iustifieth the vngodly, his faith is reputed for righteousnesse*; and so as *Basil* saith, *he is iustified by faith alone,* [x] *the loue of the Father, and the righteousnesse of Christ* the Sonne *couering the multitude of his sinnes*: so that they are as if they had neuer bin, and he as if he had offended nothing, as before hath bene declared. *Origens* testimony which is the last of al, declareth plainly the same that *Basils* doth, that [y] *the iustification of faith alone is sufficient, so that a man onely beleeuing is iustified, though there haue bene no good worke performed by him.* For example hereof he alledgeth the *thiefe on the crosse,* [z] *to whom for faith alone Christ said, This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.* *M. Bishop* answereth againe, that *Origen excludes no*

f *Basil. ser. de fide Character & insigne Chr stianorum.*

t Rom. 4. 5.

u *Oecumen. in Rom. 4. Ei qui ab oper. bus fiduciã non habet.*

x *Bern. in Cant. ser. 23. Charitas patris ipsum cooperit multitudinem peccatorum. Et ser. 61. Iustitia tua in me operit multitudinem peccatorum.*

y *Orig. in Rom. cap. 3. Dixit sufficere solius fidei iustificationem, ita vt credens tantummodo quis iustificetur etiamsi nihil ab eo operis fuerit expletum.*

z *Pro sola fide ait ei Iesus, Amẽ dico tibi, &c.*

*good*

*good disposition in vs to iustification.* A strange matter, that these Fathers should haue so little discretion still to be vrging *faith alone, faith alone*, and yet should meane to leaue a place to *M. Bishops good dispositions*, whereby *faith alone* is ouerthrowne. But he addeth out of his master *Bellarmine*, that *faith is opposed to outward works*, so that *Origens* meaning is, *that a man may be saued without doing outwardly any good works, if he want time and place.* And what are those outward works? Forsooth *Bellarmine* nameth *to fast, and to giue almes.* Absurd Friar, as if there were no *outward good works* to be done, but only fasting and giuing of almes. *M. Bishop* here vnder the name of *dispositiõs*, setteth forth vnto vs many good works of the *thiefe* in that short time of his being vpõ the crosse, *the feare of God, hope, faith, repentance, confession of sinnes, loue towards God and his neighbour, in reprehending his fellowes blasphemy, and defending Christs innocency*, and yet of him *Origen* affirmeth the same that *Chrysostomes* did before of *Abraham*, that not for any works, but he was iustified by faith alone.[a] *Christ did not enquire concerning him*, saith he, *what he had wrought before, nor did looke what work he performed when he had beleeued: but being to goe into Paradise, tooke him to accompany him, being iustified onely by his confession*, that is, by his faith which he vttered, & shewed by his confession of Christ. The other example there alleadged by *Origen*, maketh the matter as plaine, which is of the woman in the Gospel, that washed Christs feet with her teares, and wiped them with the haires of her head, whose good works *M. Bishop* hath noted also[b] before: to whom notwithstanding[c] *not for any work of the Law, but for faith onely*, saith *Origen, Iesus said, thy sinnes are forgiuen thee: and againe, Thy faith hath saued thee.* Yea but *Origen* saith,[d] *that faith cannot be imputed to iustice, to such as beleeue in Christ, vnlesse they doe with all put off the old man.* And we say no lesse, that iustification cannot be separated from sanctification; but where the one is, there is the other also: and yet it is distinctly to be considered what belongeth to the one and what belongeth to the other. He correcteth the opinion of them, who thinke profession of faith to be faith, and thereupon saith as we do, that to such their faith, because indeed it is no true faith, cannot be reputed for righteousnesse. Therefore of faith he said before: [e] *Do not thinke, that he that hath such a faith, whereby being iustified he hath to reioice with God, can together therewith haue*

a *Super hoc non requisiuit Dominus quid prius actus esset, nec expectauit quod operatus cùm credidisset, explesset, sed sola confessione iustificatum comitem sibi Paradisum ingressurus assumpsit.*

b *Sect. 21.*

c *Origen. ibid. Ex nullo legis opere, sed pro sola fide.*

d *Idem in c. 4.*

e *Ibid. Ne putes quod si quis habeat talem fidem ex qua iustificatus habeat gloriam apud Deum, possit simul cum ea habere & iniustitiam: si enim qui credit quod Iesus est Christus ex Deo natus est, & qui natus est ex Deo non peccat, manifestum est, quia qui credit Iesu Christo non peccat: quòd si peccat, certum est quia non credit ei, & Certum est eum qui vere credit, opus fidei & iustitiæ operari & totum bonum tatis.*

vnrigh-

*vnrighteousnesse. For if he that beleeueth that Iesus is Christ, be borne of God; and he that is borne of God sinneth not, it is manifest, that hee that beleeueth in Iesus Christ, sinneth not; and if he doe sinne,* (that is, giue himselfe to sinne) *it is certaine that he beleeueth not. Certaine it is, that he that truely beleeueth, doth worke the worke of faith and righteousnesse, and of all goodnesse.* Thus he saith as we do, that true faith cannot be separed from godly life: so that a man cannot haue fellowship with Christ by iustification, who by sanctification also hath not fellowship with him. But the roote of all is faith, by which alone we are iustified, and so the barre of sinne is taken away, that diuided before betwixt God and vs, that so the sanctifying spirit of God may haue accesse vnto vs, to worke in vs the good worke of God, and so to prepare vs to that inheritance, to the hope wherof he hath called vs. As for the other place that he citeth, it is the same in effect with that of *Ignatius*[1] before alleaged and containeth nothing but what we also teach, as hath beene declared there.

[1] Sect. 16.

## 31. W. Bishop.

*The third Difference of Iustification, is how farre forth good works are required thereto.*

Page 91. *Master Perkins* saith, That after the doctrine of the Church of Rome, there be two kinds of Iustification: the first, when of a sinner one is made iust: the which is of the meere mercy of God through Christ, without any merit of man, onely some certaine good deuotions of the soule, (as the acts of Faith, Feare, Hope, Charity, Repentance,) go before to prepare, (as it were) the waie, and to make it more fit to receiue that high grace of iustification.

The second Iustification is, when a iust man by the exercise of vertues is made more iust: as a child new borne, doth by nouriture grow day by day bigger: of this increase of grace, Catholiks hold good works to be the meritorious cause.

M Perkins *first granteth that good works do please God, and haue a temporall reward.*

2. *That they are necessary to saluation, not as the cause therof, but either as markes in a way to direct vs towards saluation: or as fruits and*

*and signes of righteousnes, to declare one to be iust before men: al which he shuffleth in, rather to delude our argument, then for that they seem much of good works, which they hold to bee no better then deadly sinnes.*

*The maine difference then betweene vs consisteth in this: whether good works be the true cause indeed of the increase of our righteousnes, which we call the second iustification: or whether they bee onely fruits, signes or markes of it.*

R. ABBOT.

Here *M. Bishop*, it seemeth, did not well like that *M. Perkins* should do the Church of Rome that wrong, to make her better then indeed she is: for whereas he had said, that they exclude all workes from the first iustification, and confesse it to bee wholly of grace, *M. Bishop* reformeth his error by adding, that *certaine good denotions of the soule, (as the acts of faith, feare, hope, charity, repentance,) go before to prepare the way to iustification*, all which it hath bene his drift hitherto to proue to be properly and truely the causes thereof. Now as touching the point in hand. *M. Perkins* obserueth three things accorded vnto by vs, in the recitall whereof *M. Bishop* vseth his wonted guise of deceit and fraud. First, we graunt, that good works do please God, and are approued of him, and therefore haue reward: which we intend both temporall and eternall, but he mentioneth it as if we affirmed no other, but onely *temporall reward*. Secondly, we say that they are necessarie to salnatiō, not as causes either conseruant, adiuuant, or procreant, but either as consequent fruits of that faith which is necessary to saluation, or as marks in a way, or rather the way it selfe leading to saluation. Thirdly we say, that the righteous man is in some sort iustified by workes, as *S. Iames* saith that *Abraham* was iustified by *workes*, that is declared and made manifest to be iust. And this he acknowledgeth to be in some sort also before God, for that it pleaseth God by our workes to take the sight and knowledge of our faith; albeit we forbeare so to speak, both for auoiding confusion in this disputation of iustification properly vnderstood in the sight of God, and also for that the same phrase in the Apostles writing of that point, sounds another way. This last *M. Bishop* here cōcealeth, fearing left

it

it should preuent him of some of his cauils, but that which he doth alledge, he saith *is shuffled in rather to delude their arguments, then that we esteeme much of good workes, which* (he saith) *were held to bee no better then deadly sinnes*. Thus the glosing sycophant still playeth his part, still peruerting sometimes our saying, sometimes our meaning. Where hee cannot oppugne that which we teach, he will make his Reader beleeue, that we meane not as we say. We see no such difference betwixt them and vs, betwixt their liues and ours, but that we may well be thought to esteeme good works, as much as they do. We would be ashamed to be such as their stories haue described their Popes, and Cardinals, and Bishops, nay, as *M. Bishop* and his fellowes haue described the Iesuites to be. Whereas he saith, that we account *good works no better then deadly sinnes*, he very impudently falsifieth that which wee say. VVe affirme the good workes of the faithfull to be glorious and acceptable in Gods sight for Christs sake, being done in his name, and offred vpon the altar of faith in him. The imperfection thereof is accidentall, and taketh not away the nature of a good worke, but onely maketh it an vnperfect good worke: which imperfection notwithstanding were sufficient to cause the work to be reiected, if in rigor and extremity God should weigh the same; which hee doth not, but mercifully pardoneth it for Christs sake. Seeing then the blemish set aside, we acknowledge it to remaine intirely a good worke, being the work of the grace of God, to bee accepted and rewarded of God, with what conscience doth this brabler say, that of good workes wee make no better then deadly sinnes? As touching the question propounded by him, it consisteth of two parts: the one, of the increase of righteousnesse: the other, of the cause of that increase. VVe say, that the righteousnesse wherby we are to be iustified before God, admitteth no increase, because it must bee perfect righteousnesse: for perfect righteousnesse consisteth *in indiuisibls*, if any thing be taken from it, it is not perfect: and if it be not perfect, it cannot iustifie before God. Now by *M. Bishop* it appeareth, that the inherent righteousnes which they say is infused into a man in his first iustification, is vnperfect, because it remaineth afterwards to be increased. Of the same inherent iustice wee also make no question, but that there is an encrease thereof to bee expected and laboured for, and that we are therein to thriue and grow from day to day: but

hence

hence we argue, that it is not that that can make a man iust in the sight of God: for the defect that is thereof, is not by a meere priuation, but by admixtion of the contrarie: [a] *ex vitio est, it is by reason of some corruption*, as *S. Austin* saith. Yea, [b] *there is sinne*, as hee again saith, *when charity* (that is inherent iustice) *is lesse then it ought to be*. But where sinne is, a man cannot bee said to bee iust in the sight of God. Therefore by the Popish imagined first iustification, a man cannot be iustified in the sight of God: no, nor by their second iustification, because it neuer groweth to that, but that it is still capable of increase. It remaineth therefore, that we are iust in the sight of God only by the righteousnes of Christ, which is without increase, being fully absolute and perfect according to the prescript forme of the law, the same being vndertaken for our sakes, and peformed in our name But whereas we acknowledge the increase of inherent righteousnesse, there groweth a question of the cause of this increase. The Romish doctrine is, that the grace of God is [c] *like vnto a staffe put into a mans hand* to stay him, and that it is left to his *freewill* either to vse this staffe to keepe him vp, or to leaue it and so to fall *Freewill* then (say they) vsing well the grace that it hath receiued, deserueth thereby an increase of iustice and righteousnesse. Thus they stil hang all vpon the merit and free wil of man: they thinke scorne to haue any thing of gift, but one way or other will deserue all. But the doctrine of truth teacheth vs to conceiue all to be of grace, both the first gift of sanctification, and all the succeeding increase thereof. For although it bee true, that God to the thankfull receiuing and vsing of his gifts, doth adde greater measure thereof, according to that of our Sauior: [e] *To him that hath shall be giuen*, that is, saith *S. Austin*, [f] *To them that vse well that which they haue receiued*, yet that which is added, is but [g] *grace for grace*, and [h] *the rendring of one gift to another gift*. God himselfe giuing himselfe occasion by one gift, of the bestowing of another. As he giueth faith, and to faith giueth that for which we beleeue; as he giueth vs to pray, and to our prayer giueth that for which we pray: so in all the rest he giueth grace, and giueth to vse well the grace that he hath giuen; and to the well vsing thereof giueth also further measure and increase of grace, that both in the gift and in the increase all praise and glory may redound to him. The meanes in vs whereby this increase is wrought vnto vs, is our faith; which,

a *Auguſt Epiſt.* 29.
b *Idem, de perf. iuſtit. Peccatum eſt cùm non eſt charitas quæ eſſe debet, vel minor eſt quàm debet.*
c *Coſter. Enchi. cap* 5. *Eſt hæc gratia in arbitrio voluntatis, quemadmodum baculus in manu contaſcentis, cuius auxilio ſi velit vtetur: ſin minùs poterit eam remouere.*
e Mat. 25. 29.
f *Aug. de doct. Chriſt. lib.* 1. *ca.* 1. *Dabitur habentibus, id eſt, cum benignitate vtentibus eo quod acceperunt.*
g Ioh. 1. 16.
h *Fulgent. ad Monim. lib.* 1. *Dona ſua donis ſuis reddit.*

as it first receiueth the spirit, so receiueth also the increase of it, whilest by the growth thereof we grow more into Christ, and thereby are more and more partakers of his life. i *That heauenly Sunne*, saith *Ambrose, is increased or diminished vnto me accoding to my faith.* Now thē to determine the point wherupon we are heer to insist, it is not, whether inherent righteousnesse may be increased, for that we denie not; nor whether good works be meritorious causes of the increase of it, for that belōgeth properly to the questiō of merits: but the question is, whether in the increase of righteousnes, which they tearme second iustification, we grow to any such perfection, as that therby we may be found perfectly iust in the sight of God, by vertue and force thereof to be accepted vnto euerlasting life.

i *Ambros. in Luc. ca. 11. li. 10. Mihi fide mea Sol ille caleſtis vel minuitur vel augetur.*

## 32. W. Bishop.

M. Perkins *pretends to proue, that they are no cause of the increase of our iustice: and yet frames not one argument directly to that purpose, but repeates those obiections, and proposeth them now at large, which we made before against the first iustificatiō: the which although impertinent to this place, yet I will solue them first, and then set downe our owne.*

We conclude that a man is iustified by faith, without the works of the law.

Answer. *The Apostle there speaketh of the iustification of a sinner: for he saith before, that he hath proued, both Iew and Greeke, to bee vnder sinne; and that all haue sinned, and need the glory of God: wherefore this place appertaines not vnto the second iustification, and excludes only either works of the law, as not necessary vnto the first iustification of a sinner: against the Iewes who thought and taught them to be necessary, or else against the Gentils any work of ours, from being any meritorious cause of that first iustification: for we acknowledge very willingly (as you haue heard often before) that euery sinner is iustified freely of the meer grace of God, through the merit of Christ onely, and without any merit of the sinner himselfe: and yet is not a sinner (being of yeares of discretiō) meerly passiue in that his iustificatiō, as* M. Perkins *very absurdly saith for in their owne opinion he must beleeue (which is an action) and in ours not only beleeue, but also Hope, Loue, and Repent: and this kind of iustification excludeth all boasting in our soule, as well as theirs. For as they must grant, that they may not brag of their faith, although it be an act*

of

*of theirs ſo neceſſarily required at their iuſtification, that without it they could not be iuſtified: euen ſo let them think of the reſt of thoſe good preparations, which we hold to be neceſſary, that wee cannot truly boaſt of them, as though they came of our ſelues: but we confeſſe all theſe good inſpirations, as all other good, to deſcend from the bounteous liberality of the father of lights: and for the yeelding of our conſent to them, we can no more vaunt, then of conſenting vnto faith: all which is no more, then if a man be mired in a lake and vnable of himſelfe to get out, would bee content that another of his goodneſſe ſhould helpe him out of it. Yet obſerue by the way, that* S.Paul *forbiddeth not all glorying or boaſting:* For he glorieth in the hope of glory of the Son of God, and in his tribulations. *Againe:* He defineth that we may glory in meaſure, and that he might glory in his power, and that he was conſtrained to glory in his viſions and reuelations. *So that a good Chriſtian may glory in our Lord and in his heauenly gifts, ſo it be in meaſure & due ſeaſon, acknowledging them from whence they come. But to boaſt and ſay, that either God needed vs, or that our good parts were cauſe that God called vs firſt to his ſeruice, is both falſe and vtterly vnlawfull.* Rom. 5. 2.Cor.10. 2.Cor.12. Eph:2.3.

So that by grace ye are ſaued through faith, and that not of our ſelues, it is the gift of God, not of works leſt any man ſhould boaſt himſelf, *is nothing againſt our doctrine of iuſtification, but too too ignorantly or malitiouſly cited againſt it: and not alſo with* S.Auguſtin, *that faith is there mentioned, to exclude all merits of our works, which went before and might ſeeme to the ſimple to haue beene ſome cauſe, why God beſtowed his firſt grace vpon vs: but no virtuous diſpoſitions requiſit for the better preparation to the ſame grace: and therefore very fondly doth* M.Perkins *inferre, that in that ſentence* S.Paul *ſpeaketh of works of grace, becauſe in the text following he mentioned good works. Whereas the Apoſtle putteth an euident diſtinction betweene thoſe two kinde of works, ſignifying the firſt,* to be of our ſelues: *the ſecond,* to proceede from vs as Gods workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Ieſus, *and the firſt, he calleth* Works *ſimply: the ſecond,* Good works, prepared of God for vs to walke in after our firſt iuſtification. *What groſſe ignorance then was it, to take theſe two ſo diſtinct manner of works for the ſame, and to ground himſelfe ſo boldly vpon it?* Lib.3.q.76.

R. Abbot.

The queſtion intended by *M.Perkins* is expreſly propoũded, *how*

*farre foorth goodworks are required by iustification*: namely before God, which he determineth thus, that they are required, not as causes for which we are iustified, either in the beginning of grace, or in the proceeding thereof, but onely as effects and fruits of iustification. Which although it be implied in that that before hath been said, of being iustified by faith alone, yet neither as touching first nor second iustification, is directly handled by *M. Perkins*, but only in this place. Here therefore he disputeth wholy as touching iustification before God, that good works concurre not as any causes thereof, and bringeth his arguments directly to that point. First the Apostle saith, [a] *We conclude that a man is iustified by faith without the works of the law. M. Bishop* excepteth against this place, as meant *of the first iustification of a sinner, not appertaining to the second iustification.* But we find but one iustification spoken of by S. *Paul*, both beginning and continuing in faith: for being still sinners, so long as here we liue it must needes be, that that which the Apostle saith of the iustification of a sinner must still appertaine vnto vs, & therfore that both firstly and lastly we are iustified by faith without the works of the law. And if there were any second iustification, that whith the Apostle saith must necessarily be taken to belong to it. For hee writeth these things to the Romans, to the Galathians, which long before had beleeued and beene baptized, and yet now still informeth them, that their iustification is by faith without the works of the law: stil he saith, [b] *If righteousnesse be by the law, Christ died in vaine:* yea he proueth by the Prophets words, not that the sinner onely, but [c] *the iust shall liue by faith*, as *Hierome* mentioning out of the vulgar Latin translation of the Psalmes, these words: [d] *He will saue them for nothing*, addeth, [e] *No doubt but he meaneth the iust, who are not saued by their owne merit, but by the mercy of God.* But it is further to be noted, that he bringeth in *Abraham* for an example of this iustification, euen then when he had long been the seruant of God, and shewed singular deuotion & obedience vnto him. He bringeth for another example the Prophet *David*, a man *according to Gods own heart*, who from his childhood had been called of God, yet now still acknowledging his blessednes to consist in the [f] *Lords imputing of righteousnesse without works*. It is euident therefore that *M. Bishops* exception is vnsufficient, & that not only at a mans first entrāce into the state of grce, which he calleth the first iustificatiō, but

a Rom. 3. 28.

b Gal. 2. 21.

c Cap. 3. 11.
d Psal. 55. 7. vulg. lat. Pro nihilo saluos faciet eos.
e Hieron. aduer. Pelag. lib. 2. Haud dubium quin iustos qui non proprio merito, sed dei saluantur clementia.
f Rom. 4. 6.

but afterwards alſo a man is *iuſtified by faith without the works of the law*, and therfore works can be no meritorious cauſe of any ſecond iuſtification. His acknowledgement, that *a ſinner is iuſtified freely of the meere grace of God through the merit of Chriſt only, without any merit of the ſinner himſelfe*, is a meere colluſion and mockery. For if a man be iuſtified by workes, then it is not by meere grace. He ſaith [g] before of the woman that waſhed the feet of Chriſt, that her loue and other vertuous diſpoſitions were cauſes why ſhe was iuſtified, and determineth ſtill, that *hope, feare, repentance, charity*, concur as cauſes thereof. Yea but (ſaith hee) they are no meritorious cauſes; there is the *merit of Chriſt only, and no merit of the ſinner himſelfe*. So then iuſtification is by workes, but not by merits. But we ſee the Apoſtle reſolueth againſt workes, of merits he ſaith nothing: hee ſpeaketh of that that is, not of that that cannot be; works there may be, but merit there can be none, as is afterwards to be declared. See then the madneſſe of theſe men: the Apoſtle ſaith, [h] *Not by workes*; yes, ſay they, it is by works, but it is not by merits: the Apoſtle ſaith, [i] *If it be of grace it is not of works*, yes, ſay they, it is both by grace and by works, but it is not by merits. Thus impudently they confront the Apoſtle, and ſeeke to tye vpon him a flat contradictiõ to that he ſaith. They will ſeem to vphold grace, by excluding merit, when as the Apoſtle teſtifieth, they plainely ouerthrow it by affirming workes, becauſe (as hath bene before alledged out of *Auſtin*) *grace is not grace in any reſpect, except it be free in euery reſpect*. Yea neither do they wholly exclude merit, but affirme the ſame [k] *ſome ſort*, euen in their firſt iuſtificatiõ, as I haue before diuers times obſerued out of *Bellarmine*. Thus they play faſt and looſe, and wold faine ſay, but cannot well tell what to ſay. With *Pelagius* they are aſhamed to omit the grace of God, and yet they ſo teach it, as that they make it of no effect. Now becauſe our iuſtification is meerly by the gift of God, therfore *M. Perkins* ſaith, that the ſinner in his iuſtification is meerely *paſſiue*, meaning, that we do nothing at all, wherein conſiſteth any part of our righteouſneſſe with God. *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that this is *abſurd, becauſe a man muſt beleeue, and to beleeue is an action*. But it is abſurd onely to an abſurd and ignorant man, who vnderſtandeth not what he readeth. To beleeue is an action, but he hath had occaſion enough to know and vnderſtand if ignorance had not blinded him, that wee place no part of

g *Sect.* 21.

h Gal. 2. 16. Ephes. 2. 9.

i Rom. 11. 6.

k *in Bellar. de iuſt. lib.* 1. *cap.* 17.

righteouſneſſe in the very act of faith, but in the thing receiued thereby. Chriſt onely is our righteouſneſſe, and him we receiue by faith. God iuſtifieth, we are iuſtified. God imputeth righteouſneſſe, to vs it is imputed: God then is the agent, we the ſubiect whereon he worketh, patients, receiuers, and no way workers of that which is our righteouſneſſe before God. And to this his vnderſtanding ſhould leade him in that iuſtification which they maintaine. For although they ſay that by faith, hope, charity, repentance, which are actions, they obtaine iuſtification, yet the very habite of iuſtice is with them a thing meerely infuſed of God, & not the act of man himſelfe. Therfore as touching the very habit of iuſtice a man muſt be onely paſſiue, not actiue, in the ſame ſenſe as *M. Perkins* ſpeaketh, onely a receiuer, and not at all a worker thereof. But now hee telleth vs, that the iuſtification which they ſo teach, wrought and procured by hope, feare, loue, &c. *excludeth all boaſting as well as ours.* But that cannot be: for the Apoſtle telleth vs, that [l] *boaſting or reioycing is not excluded by the law of works, but by the law of faith.* So long as any thing is attributed to our workes in this behalfe, wee haue ſomewhat to glory in, as that by our workes, and for our workes ſake we haue obtained that which we haue. The Apoſtle ſaith, that [m] *if Abraham were iuſtified by workes, hee had whereof to glorie or reioyce*; and therefore it is not true, that iuſtification being attributed to workes, we haue nothing wherof to reioyce or boaſt our ſelues. Neither doth *M. Biſhops* explanation help the matter at all, that *we cannot boaſt of thoſe preparations, as though they came of our ſelues:* becauſe we ſee the Phariſee in the Goſpell to glorie of that, which notwithſtanding he confeſſeth to be the gift of God: [n] *O God I thanke thee*, ſaith he, *that I am not as other men are.* But by his words of theſe *good inſpirations deſcending frō the father of lights* he doth but abuſe his Reader, dealing only colourably, as *Pelagius* the hereticke was wont to doe. For they make God the occaſion only, and not the true cauſe of them. They make him externally an aſſiſtant to them, but the internall producing and proper originall of them, is of the *Free will* of man, which is the cauſe why they affirm theſe workes that go before iuſtificatiō not to be meritorious, as they ſay thoſe are that follow after. For if they made them eſſentially the workes of grace, they could haue no colour to attribute merit to the one, and to deny it to the other. Yea *M. Biſhop* himſelf appa-

l Rom. 3. 27.

m Rom. 4. 2.

n Luc. 18 11. *Auguſt. in Pſal. 31. Cùm dicebas gratias tibi, fatebatur ab illo ſe accepiſſe quod habebat. Hieron. aduer. Pelag. li. 3. Ille gratias agit Deo quia ipſius miſericordia non ſit ſicut cæteri homines &c.*

apparantly excludeth them from being the works of grace, in that preſently after he calleth the grace of iuſtification, *the firſt grace*, as being ignorant of the language of their own ſchooles, wheras theſe works are ſaid to goe before, to prepare vs for the receiuing of iuſtifying grace. In theſe works of preparatiõ therfore there is apparantly ſome what attributed to man, whereof he hath to glory in himſelfe: for that howſoeuer being helped of God, yet hee doth ſomewhat himſelfe, for which God beſtoweth vpon him the gift of iuſtification. Yea *M. Biſhop* plainely aſcribeth to him ſomewhat wherof to reioice, in that he aſcribeth it to him *to cõſent to the grace of God*. Yea but *a man*, ſaith he, *can no more vaunt of conſent to theſe works, then of conſent to faith*: true, and therefore if either way hee haue any thing of himſelfe, he hath ſomwhat whereof to boaſt. *M. Biſhop* therfore buildeth vp his own glory in both, ſo acknowledging the grace of God both in faith and works, as that al is nothing, but by the free wil of man. Now we on the other ſide, together with the auncient Church, [o] *ſuffer not, nay, we vtterly forbid, that either in our faith, or in our worke, we challenge to our ſelues any thing as our owne*. But in the iuſtification of faith boaſting or reioycing is excluded, not onely for that faith and all conſent of faith is wholly the gift of God, but alſo for that to faith nothing at all is aſcribed for it ſelfe, but onely to Chriſt who is receiued thereby, and is it ſelfe a meere acknowledgment, that we haue all that we haue of the ſoueraigne bountie and mercy of God, only for his owne take, & not for any thing that is in vs. Now therfore we hence argue againſt *M. Biſhops* iuſtification, that that is the only true doctrin of iuſtification, by which mans boaſting or reioicing is excluded. By the doctrine of iuſtification by workes, mans boaſting is not excluded. Therefore the doctrin of iuſtification by works, is not the true doctrine of iuſtification. As for his compariſon of a man *mired in a lake, and content that another ſhould helpe him out*, it ſauoureth verie ſtrongly of the ſtinke of the Pelagians, leauing in a man both will and power for the helping of himſelfe; whereas the Scripture affirming vs to be [p] *dead in treſpaſſes and ſinnes*, bereaueth vs altogether of all, either will or power, whereby wee ſhould yeelde any furtherance to the ſauing of our ſelues. But the ſame is alſo otherwiſe vnfit, becauſe the conuerſion of a man is an acceptance of a ſeruice and an entrance into it, wherein hee is to beſtowe his labour and

o *Fulgen. ad Monim. lib. 1. Nullatenus ſinimus, immo ſalubriter prohibemus tam in noſtra fide quàm in noſtro opere ſanquam noſtrum nobis aliquid vendicare.*

p Epheſ. 2. 1.

paines to deserue well, as *M. Bishop* saith, at his hands whose seruant he is, and by couenant to merit heauen. Hereto hee worketh partly by grace, as he saith, and partly by free will, and therefore hauing merited and deserued, he hath somewhat in respect of himselfe wherein to glory and reioice: whereas the course that God taketh is, [q] *that we may know at that day*, as *S. Bernard* saith, *that not for the workes of righteousnesse which wee haue done, but of his owne mercy he hath saued vs.* For this cause albeit hee could haue perfected vs at once, and euen at the first haue reformed vs to full and vnspotted righteousnesse to serue him accordingly, yet hath hee thought good to leaue vs groning vnder a burthen of sin, and vnder many infirmities and imperfections in the seruice that we doe vnto him, that the sight of our foule feet may still pull down our Peacocks taile, and we may alwaies fully know, that we are to giue all the honour and glory of our saluation to God alone. But *M. Bishop* telleth vs, that *all glorying and boasting is not forbidden*; and we acknowledge the same, for else the Apostle wold not haue said, [r] *He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.* Our glorying or reioicing must be with the acknowledgement of his goodnesse, & to the magnifying of him, & not of our selues. He that exalteth himselfe as the Pharisee did, in that which he confesseth to be the gift of God, reioiceth against God. But *M. Bishop* offendeth both waies: he attributeth not all vnto God, but somewhat at least to the *free wil* of man. Againe, it is not entirely the glory of God that he respecteth, but [s] *the bringing of dignity vnto men*, as he hath before expressed. Therefore albeit he wil not haue a man *boast and say, that his good parts were the cause that God called him first to his seruice*, yet he maketh no exception, but that a man may boast of the good works that he hath performed in seruing him, and may glory that his good parts therin are the cause why God adiudgeth heauen vnto him as iustly deserued, which is that against which the Scripture wholy driueth, teaching vs to confesse that which *Austin* doth, that [t] *not for performance of merits, but in mercy and louing kindnesse the soule of man is crowned*: and to say with *Hilary* [u] *That wee are what we were not; that we shall be, what wee are not, it hath no other cause at all, but onely the mercy of God.* Againe, hee will not haue vs *boast and say, that God needed vs for our selues*, but wee must needes say with *Tertullian*: [x] *There is none but needeth him, of whose*

q *Bernard Cant. Ser. 50. Vt sciamus in die illa, quia non ex operibus iustitiæ quæ fecimus nos, sed pro misericordia sua saluos nos fecit.*

r 1. Cor. 1, 31.

s *Sect. 2.*

t *Aug. Hypog. lib. 3. Intelligo, in miseratione & misericordia, non in factione meritorum animam coronari.*

u *Hilar. in Psal. 135. Quod fuimus qui non fuimus, quod erimus quod non fuimus, causam aliam non habet nisi misericordiæ Dei.*

x *Tertul. aduer. Hermog. Nemo non eget eo de cuius vtitur.*

*whoſe he vſeth any thing.* Their doctrine of *free will* maketh God to ſtand in neede of vs, becauſe by it God bringeth not the worke of our ſaluation to paſſe, but at our will. It is in the power of our free will, either to helpe it or hinder it, either by admitting or reiecting the grace of God. For the performance therfore of his purpoſe and promiſe, God muſt ſtand in need of our will, to conſent to his worke, or elſe it ſucceedeth not. For the auoiding of which abſurdity, we muſt confeſſe, that God vſeth nothing in vs, for the effecting of our ſaluation, but what he himſelf graciouſly worketh in vs. Our conſenting, our beleeuing, our willing, our working, all is of God, and nothing is there therein that we can call ours. Now therefore it is plaine, that *M. Perkins* did not *ignorantly* and *maliciouſly*, as this ignorant wrangler ſpeaketh, but iudiciouſly and truly apply againſt them the place to the Epheſians, y *By grace ye are ſaued through faith; not of your ſelues, it is the gift of God; not of workes, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt.* Where the Apoſtle aſcribing all to grace through faith in Chriſt, taketh exception generally againſt works, and giueth to vnderſtand, that they are effects, not cauſes of ſaluation, becauſe God hauing firſt by faith put vs in the ſtate of ſaluation, doth conſequently create vs anew in Chriſt Ieſus, vnto good works. *M. Biſhops* exception is, that the Apoſtle there excludeth onely *the works that bee of our ſelues*, before wee bee iuſtified. But that his exception is very vaine, appeareth plainely by that the Apoſtle for reaſon of that that he ſaith, *Not of works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt*, addeth in the next words, *For wee are his workmanſhip created in Chriſt Ieſus vnto good works, which God hath prepared for vs to walke in.* Where one way to vnderſtand *works* in the one ſentence which is to be proued, and another way to vnderſtand *good works* in the other ſentence which is the proofe, is to make the Apoſtle to vtter as reaſonleſſe reaſons as *M. Biſhops* idle head is wont to doe. For what ſenſe were it to ſay, wee are not ſaued by workes that are of our ſelues before we be iuſtified, becauſe wee are Gods creation and workmanſhip in the good works that wee doe after our iuſtification? But the Apoſtles meaning is very euident, we are not ſaued by any good works that we doe; for our good works are none of ours, but they are his workmanſhip in vs, by whom we are ſaued, who hauing by his calling entitled vs to ſaluation, hath prepared good workes as the way for vs to walke in, to the ſame ſalua-

y Epheſ. 2.

ſaluation. It was not then *M. Perkins ignorance, to take two diſtinct manner of works for the ſame,* but *M. Biſhops* abſurd ſhifting, to make a diſtinction of workes there where the ſequell of the text plainely conuinceth, that there is no difference at all. But wee would gladly know of him, to which manner of workes he refereth his *vertuous diſpoſitions?* To the latter hee cannot, becauſe, *they proceede from vs as Gods workmanſhippe created in Chriſt Ieſus,* which we are not till we bee iuſtified, and they are for vs *to walke in after our iuſtification.* If to the former, then we ſee they are by the Apoſtle excluded from iuſtification. So in neither place doth he ſay any thing of them, and becauſe he knew them not, he hath wholy left them out. He was vndoubtedly to blame to conceiue ſo little vertue in Maſter *Biſhops vertuous diſpoſitions,* as not to think them worth the ſpeaking of. But it is woorth the noting, to what faſhion hee by his deuice hath hewed the words of the Apoſtle: *Not by works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt*; that is, not by workes that are of our ſelues, but yet by *vertuous good diſpoſitions* and *works of preparation,* which are partly of God, and partly of our ſelues; and yet, as I haue before ſaid, thy make the eſſentiall production of theſe workes of preparation, to bee onely of our ſelues, becauſe as yet there is [z] *no infuſed or inhabitant grace,* whence they ſhould proceede; and therefore out of their owne grounds it muſt follow, that the ſame works of preparation are heere excluded by the Apoſtle. But ſee the ſingular impudency of this man, who maketh S. *Auſtin* a witneſſe of his *vertuous diſpoſitiõs,* who hath not in the place alleaged by him, ſo much as any ſemblance or ſhew for proofe thereof. *Note with S. Auſtin,* ſaith he, *that faith excludeth all merits of our works, but no vertuous diſpoſitions for preparation to grace.* Lewd Sophiſter, where is that note found in *S. Auſtin?* in what words is it ſet downe? What? ſtill lie, and nothing but lie? *S. Auſtine* forſooth maketh the Apoſtle *to exclude all merits of our workes which went before, and might ſeeme to the ſimple to haue beene ſome cauſe why God beſtowed his firſt grace vpon vs,* but not all workes; for there are workes of preparation, which Doctor *Biſhop,* no ſimple man I warrant you, defendeth to be the cauſe why God beſtoweth vpon vs his firſt grace. Will he make *S. Auſtine* the author of ſo abſurd and impious a gloſſe? *S. Auſtine* vnder the name of *merits* wholy excludeth workes, vnderſtanding by *merits* any thing going

[z] *Coſter. Enchirid. cap. 5. Hominis liberum arbitriũ auxilio Dei needum inhabitãtis, ſed mouentis & ad quæntis ſe præparat ad iuſtificationem, non ſolum patiendo ſed operando & agendo.*

going before iuſtification that ſhould bee vnto God a motiue or cauſe to beſtow his grace vpon vs, as I haue ſhewed [a] before. Therefore he doth not direct the words of *S. Paul* onely againſt *merits*, but ſimply againſt works, that he affirmeth [b] *a man to be iuſtified without workes precedent or going before*; that he teacheth *that not for any good worke paſt, a man attaineth to the iuſtification of faith; that a man is not iuſtified by workes that go before faith*, meaning by faith not a faith which is before iuſtification, but the faith in which our iuſtification is begun, as appeareth very plainly by that that he ſaith in another place, [c] *If we haue no righteouſnes, we haue no faith; but if we haue faith, we haue alſo ſome part of righteouſneſſe already.* And thus perpetually he excludeth all workes going before iuſtification, from being any cauſes thereof, and ſtill maketh iuſtification the beginning of all good works, ſo as that [d] *without the grace of God* (which with him is no other but the grace [e] *whereby we are iuſtified*) *wee can in no ſort thinke or do any thing according vnto God.* Of *M. Biſhops vertuous diſpoſitions* before iuſtification, hee neuer ſpeaketh word, nor euer giueth intimation of any ſuch, nay he condemneth the Pelagians for affirming the ſame, as wee haue ſeene in the queſtion of [f] *Free will.*

a Sect. 21.
b *Auguſt. li. 83. qu. q. 76. Vt nemo meritis priorum bonorum operum arbitretur ſe ad donum iuſtificationis peruenisſe, dicit poſſe hominē ſine operibus præcedentibus iuſtificari per fidē: dicit de operibus quæ ipſum præcedunt.*
c *Idem de verb. Apoſt. ſer. 16. Si iuſtitiæ nihil habemus nec fidem habemus. Si fidem habemus iam aliquid habemus iuſtitiæ.*
d *Idem epiſt. 46. Sine illa cogitare aliquid vel agere ſecundum Deum vlla ratione omninò non poſſumus.*
e *Epiſt. 105. Ipſam gratiam commendat Apoſtolus, quia iuſtificati ſumus vt homines iuſti eſſemus.*
f Sect. 5.

## 33. W. BISHOP.

*Now to his ſecond reaſon.* If you be circumciſed, you are bound to the whole law. *Hence thus he argueth:* If a man will be iuſtified by workes, hee is bound to fulfill the whole law, according to the rigour of it. *That is* Paules *ground*: But no man can fulfill the law, according vnto the rigour of it: *ergo.* No man can be iuſtified by workes. *He that can apply the text prefixed vnto any part of the argument*, Erit mihi magnus Apollo: *Saint* Paul *onely ſaith in theſe words*: That if you bee circumciſed, yee are bound to keepe the whole law of *Moſes*. Maiſter *Perkins*, That if a man will be iuſtified by workes, hee muſt fulfill the rigour of the law: *Which are as iuſt as* Germanes *lips, as they ſay: But* M. Perkins *ſayes, that it is Saint* Paules *ground: but he is much deceiued, for the Apoſtles ground is this: That circumciſion is as it were a profeſſion of Iudaiſme, and therefore he that would be circumcized, did make himſelfe ſubiect vnto the whole law of the Iewes. Of the poſſibilities of fulfilling* Gal. 5.

the

*the Law, because* M. Perkins *toucheth so often that string, shal bee treated in a distinct question, as soone as I haue dispatched this.*

## R. Abbot.

a Gal. 5. 3. The force of the sentence alledged, that [a] *he that is circumcised is bound to keepe the whole law*, dependeth vpon the verse going before, and that that followeth after. He saith before, [b] *If ye bee circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing*, by one particular giuing to vnderstand what was to be conceiued of the rest, that [c] *it was certaine destruction for them to thinke, that their hope and saluation was contained in such workes of the law*, because thereby they were secluded from hauing any benefit in Christ. Which as he hath namely spoken of circumcision, as being a speciall matter then spoken of, so he saith it in the verse after of the whole law; [d] *Ye are abolished from Christ, whosoeuer are iustified by the law, ye are fallen from grace* If then in any part of the law a man seeke to be iustified, he is thereby voided of the grace of Christ. Being abandoned from Christ and his grace, he hath no meanes of iustification and saluation, but by the law. He cannot be iustified by the law, but by perfect obseruing of it, because it is said, [e] *Cursed is euery man that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the law to doe them.* What then is said of circumcision, belongeth to all the workes of the law. He that seeketh to be iustified by the workes of the law, he is bound fully and perfectly to obserue the same, and if he be any where a trespasser, he cannot be iustified by the law. And rightly doth *M. Perkins* say, that this is the ground of that which the Apostle saith of circumcision, as he shall well perceiue, that obserueth how through the whole Epistle hee disputeth generally against iustificatiō by the law, to disproue the doctrine of the false Apostles, vrging for iustification circumcision and other ceremonies of the law. Therefore in the words alledged, this argument is implied; He that wil be iustified by the law, is bound to fulfil the whole law: He that seeketh to be iustified by circumcision, seeketh to be iustified by the law: hee is therefore bound to the perfect obseruation of the whole law. As for that which *M. Bishop* saith, that *circumcision is as it were a profession of Iudaisme*, it is a very idle and sleeuelesse answer. For what is *Iudaisme*, but a profession of iustification

b Ver. 2.

c *August. cont. Faust. Manich. lib. 19 cap. 17. Certa pernicies si in huiusmodi legis operibus putarēt suam spem salutemque continere.*

d Ver. 4.

e Cap. 3. 10.

by

by the law, the Iewes [c] *seeking righteousnesse not by faith, but as it were by the works of the Law.* Circumcision therefore is a profession of iustification by the law; against which the Apostles ground is, as hath beene said, that he that professeth to be iustified by the law, doth tie himselfe to obserue it without any breach, being by the law guilty of death, if he be found to transgresse in any sort. Now that there is no ableness in vs to fulfill the law, so as to be iustified thereby, it shall appeare God willing, in the place where Master *Bishop* promiseth to treate thereof. [c] Rom.9.32.

## 34. W. Bishop.

M. Perkins *third argument.* Election to saluation is of grace without works: wherefore the iustification of a sinner is of grace alone without works: because election is the cause of iustification.

Answer. *That election is of grace without works, done of our owne simple forces, or without the works of* Moses *Law: but not without prouision of good works issuing out of faith, and the helpe of Gods grace, as shall be handled more largely in the question of merits.*

## R. Abbot.

Here *M. Bishop*, to answer the argument, auoucheth a plaine point of Pelagianisme, that Gods election is vpon foresight of our good works, directly contrary to that which the Apostle defineth in the example of *Iacob*: [a] *Before the children were borne, and when they had done neither good nor euill, that the purpose of God according to election, might stand not by works, but by him that calleth, it was said, the elder shall serue the yonger, as it is written, I haue loued Iacob, and haue hated Esau.* [b] *Where,* saith S. Austine, *if the Apostle would that either the good works of the one, or the euill workes of the other that were to come should be vnderstood, he would not haue said, Not of works, but woul haue said, for the workes that were to come, and so would haue put the matter out of question.* [c] *The Pelagians said,* as he obserueth, *that of them being not yet borne, God therefore hated the one, and loued* a Rom.9.11.

b *August. Ench: cap.98. Quia in re si futura opera vel bona huius vel mala illius quæ Deus vtiq; præsciebat vellet intelligi, nequaquã diceret, non ex operibus, sed diceret ex futuris operibus, eoque modo istam solueret quæstionem &c.*

c *Idem epist.105. præcudebat. Quia*

*Ideo, inquiunt Pelagiani, nondum natorum alium oderat, alium diligebat, quia futura eorum opera istum acutissimum sensum Apostolo defuisse non mirer?*

the

*the other, becauſe hee did foreſee their works to come. Who would not wonder,* ſaith hee, *that this witty conceit ſhould bee wanting to the Apoſtle?* But his reſolution euery where is, that Gods election is the cauſe of our good works, not the foreſight of our good workes the cauſe why God elected vs. To that purpoſe he alleadgeth the words of the Apoſtle, [d] *He hath choſen vs in him before the foundations of the world, that we ſhould be holy, and without blame before him through loue;* [e] not ſaith he, *becauſe we would be, but that we ſhould be; not becauſe he foreknew that we would be ſo, but that we might bee ſo by his election of grace.* The like hee obſerueth of the ſame Apoſtles words concerning himſelfe, [f] *I haue obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful,* not for that the Lord did foreſee that he would be faithful, but by his mercy made him ſo to be. It were too long to alleage all that might be alleadged out of *Auſtine* as touching this point, but Maſter *Biſhop* hauing very nicely touched it, deferreth the reſt to the queſtion of *merits*, where he ſaith nothing directly to it. Ie ſeemeth he was ielous of the matter, and therfore was loth to wade too farre, leaſt it ſhould too plainly appeare, that *Pelagius* and he are both fallen into one pit.

d Epheſ.1.4.
e *De predeſt. ſanct. cap.8. Non quia futuros eramus ſed vt eſſemus. Et cap.19. Non quia futuros tales nos eſſe præſciuit, ſed vt eſſemus tales per ipſam electionem gratiæ.&c.*
f 1.Cor.7.25. *Aug.epiſt.105.*

## 35. W. Biſhop.

*The fourth argument.* A man muſt be fully iuſtified, before hee can doe a good worke: and therefore good works cannot goe before iuſtification. *True, not before the firſt iuſtification of a ſinner. But good Sir, you hauing made in the beginning of this laſt Article, a diſtinction betweene the firſt and ſecond iuſtification; and hauing before diſcuſſed the firſt, and the ſecond now remaining, and expecting you, why did you not ſay one word of it, the matter being ample and well worthie the handling? Albeit you will not willingly confeſſe any ſecond iuſtification as you ſay: yet had it beene your part at leaſt to haue diſproued ſuch arguments, as wee bring to proue a ſecond iuſtification: Yee acknowledge that there be degrees of ſanctification; but theſe degrees muſt bee made downeward of euill, worſer and worſt: for if all our ſanctification and beſt works be like vnto defiled cloutes, and no better then deadly ſinnes as you hold, elſe-where, let any wiſe man iudge what degrees of goodneſſe can be lodged in it. Againe, how abſurd is that poſition, that there is but one iuſtification, whereby they take faſt hold on Chriſts righ-*

Pag.76.

teouſ-

teouſneſſe, which can neuer after bee either looſed or increaſed. *Why then do you with your brother* Iouinian *maintaine, that all men are equally righteous? If it ſo be, let him that deſireth to ſee you well courſed, read* S. Hierome, S. Ambroſe, S. Auguſtine, S. Gregory. *At leaſt we muſt needs vphold, that a man is as iuſt and righteous at his firſt conuerſion, as at his death how godly a life ſoeuer he lead: againſt which I will put downe theſe reaſons following.*

Lib. 2. con. Iouin. Epiſt. 81. Epiſt. 57. Hom. 15. in Exech.

## R. Abbot.

If there can bee no good works before the firſt iuſtification of a ſinner, what ſhall we thinke of *M. Biſhops vertuous diſpoſitions* and *works of preparation*? What? are they vertuous, and yet are they not good? Nay, he hath called them [a] before *good qualities, good diſpoſitions, good preparations*, and what? were they good then, and now are they not good? Tell vs, *M. Biſhop*, your mind: are your *works of preparation* good works, or are they not good? If they bee not good, then you haue ſpoke vntruly before in calling them good. If they bee good, then it is vntruth that you ſay heere, that no good works go before the firſt iuſtification of a ſinner. Either in the one or in the other you muſt needs confeſſe, that you haue ſaid amiſſe. Now here he quarrelleth with Maiſter *Perkins*, as if he had ſaid nothing to the matter in hand, which is as hee ſaith of the ſecond iuſtification, whereas Maiſter *Perkins*, though noting their diſtinction of firſt and ſecond iuſtification, yet hath in hand wholy to exclude works from iuſtification, whence it muſt follow, that they haue no place in any ſecond iuſtification. And the argument heere propounded, directly ouerthroweth his ſecond iuſtification, though hee would not ſee ſo much. For if a man can doe no perfect good works till he be fully iuſtified, thē can he do no perfect good works till the ſecond iuſtification bee fulfilled. For a man is not fully and perfectly iuſtified, till hee haue attained to full and perfect iuſtice. Iuſtice is not full and perfect, ſo long as any thing remaineth to be added vnto it. There is ſtill ſomething to bee added in their ſecond iuſtification, till it come to his full terme. Therefore till then a man is not fully iuſtified. Now the iuſtice that is not perfect, if it bee reſpected in it ſelfe, cannot bee pleaſing vnto God. It can therefore bring forth no good works to merit at Gods hands.

[a] Sect. 30. & 32.

There

There can therefore be no good workes, whereby a man ſhould merit their ſecond iuſtification. *M. Biſhop* after his manner briefly reciteth the argument, & hauing ſo done, very ſcholerlike anſwereth to the concluſion, graunting it in one ſort, when the premiſſes inferre it in another, and yet braueth and faceth, as if the matter were wholly cleare for him. Iuſtification, as *M. Perkins* ſaith, wee make but one, but yet wee make *degrees of ſanctification, not euill, worſe and worſt*; as this cauiller fondly dreameth, but good, and better & beſt, according to the meaſure of Gods ſpirit beſtowed vpon vs, but yet ſo, as that to the good, & better, and beſt that is in this life, there cleaueth a blemiſh and ſtaine, which would cauſe the worke to be condemned, but that it is graciouſly accepted, and the imperfection thereof mercifully pardoned for Chriſts ſake, as ſhall appeare in the handling of that matter. He calleth the affirming of *one iuſtification perfect at firſt, and not after to be loſt, an abſurd poſition*; but it is not abſurd, but to abſurd men, to whom the truth it ſelfe is abſurd. There is in the ſight of God but one iuſtification onely by faith in Chriſt, vnder the couerture whereof wee ſtand thenceforth acceptable vnto God, both in our perſons, and in our workes of obedience vnto euerlaſting life. In that ſenſe as to preſent vs iuſt before God, there is no other iuſtification. That that is further, is but *declaratiua*, a iuſtification ſo called, whereby we are iuſtified and declared to be iuſtified men. The true iuſtification properly ſo called, cannot be loſt, becauſe [a] *whom God iuſtifieth he alſo glorifieth*, nor increaſed, becauſe the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt is alwaies vniforme and alike. By this righteouſneſſe being the ſame to al, all are equally righteous, but by the different grace of ſanctification in inherent righteouſneſſe, ſome are more righteous & ſome leſſer and if *Iouinian* maintained the contrary, hee erred, and therefore thoſe Fathers whom *M. Biſhop* citeth, doe not courſe vs at all, but ſay the ſame that we do, & we that they, neither is it any other but his groſſe ignorance, ſo abſurdly to miſtake one thing for another. We ſay, that there is equality of righteouſneſſe in one reſpect, and he bringeth the Fathers affirming againſt *Iouinian* what we cõfeſſe, that there is difference of righteouſneſſe in another reſpect. According to that former righteouſnes by imputation of the merit and obedience of Chriſt, a man is as righteous the firſt day of his conuerſion, as he is in the end of his life, howſoeuer as touching

[a] Rom. 8. 30

ſanctiſ

ſanctification and inherent righteouſneſſe, he grow much, and thein be renewed from day to day.

## 36. W. BISHOP.

*Firſt, that of the Reuelations:* Let him that is iuſt be yet iuſtified: *or as your text hath it:* He that is righteous, let him be more righteous: *and that of,* feare not to be iuſtified euen vntill death: *do conuince, that there are more iuſtificatiõs then one, and that a man may increaſe in iuſtification and righteouſnes vntill death. Which is confirmed where it is ſaid:* That the path of a iuſt man proceedeth, as the light doth vntill it be perfect day: *which is degrees more and more. and S.* Paule *teacheth the ſame, where he ſaith to men that giue almes plentifully:* That God will multiply their ſeed, and augment the increaſes of the fruites of their iuſtice. *Further,* S. Iames *doth moſt effectually proue this increaſe of righteouſnes, and the ſecond iuſtification, in theſe words: Abraham* our father, was he not iuſtified by workes, offering *Iſaac* his ſon vpon the altar. *That he ſpeaketh of the ſecond iuſtification is euident: for* Abraham *was iuſtified before* Iſaac *was borne, as it is moſt manifeſt by the Scripture it ſelfe: and by that heroicall act, of not ſparing his onely and intirely beloued Sonne, his iuſtice was much augmented. And the Apoſtle himſelfe ſeemeth to haue foreſeene all our aduerſaries cauillation, and to haue ſo long before preuented them. Firſt, that common ſhift of theirs (that this work was a ſigne, or the fruite onely of his faith, and no companion of it, in the matter of iuſtification) is formally confuted: for the holy Ghoſt ſpeaking diſtinctly of both his faith and worke, and ioyning them both in this act of iuſtification, attributeth the better part of it vnto his worke, thus:* Seeſt thou that faith did worke with his workes; and by the workes the faith was conſummate and made perfect. *Which he doth after fitly declare by a ſimilitude, comparing faith to the body, and good works to the ſoule: which giue life and luſtre to faith, otherwiſe faith is of little valne and eſtimation with God. Which* S. Paule *alſo teacheth at large, among other ſpeeches including this:* That if he ſhould haue al faith, and wanted charitie, he were nothing. *And comparing faith and charitie together, defineth expreſly, that charitie is the greater vertue, which charitie is the fountaine of all good workes. And ſo by this preferring theſe works of charity before faith, he doth ſtop the other ſtarting hole of the*

Cap. 22. Eccleſi. 18.
Prou. 4.
2. Cor. 9.
Cap. 2.
Gen. 15. Rom. 4.
1. Cor. 13.

*Proteſtants, that* Abraham *for ſooth was iuſtified before God, by onely faith. but was declared iuſt before men by his works: For if God eſteeme more of charity, then of our faith a man is more iuſtified before God by charity, than by faith. Againe, in the very place where this noble fact is recorded, to ſhew how acceptable it was to God himſelfe, it is ſaid in the perſone of God:* Now I know that thou loueſt me: *and to conuince all obſtinate cauilling, is it not ſaid that his faith did in this very fact coopperate with his workes, and that the worke made his faith perfect: which coniunction of both of them together doth demõſtrate that he ſpeaketh of his iuſtification before God: adding alſo,* That he was therefore called the friend of God: *which could not haue bene, if thereby he had bene onely declared iuſt before man: and this doth* S. Auguſtine *reconcile the two places of the Apoſtles,* S. Paul *and* S. Iames, *which ſeeme contrary. S. Paul* laying that a man is iuſtified by faith without workes, and *S. Iames,* that a man is iuſtified by workes and not by faith onely. That *S. Paul* ſpeaketh of works which go before faith, ſuch as we of our owne forces, without the helpe of grace are able to do: and ſuch he ſaith not to deſerue our firſt iuſtification. But *S. Iames* diſputeth of workes, which follow faith, and iſſue out of our ſoules, now garniſhed with grace, and ſuch he holdeth vs to be iuſtified by, *that is,* made more and more iuſt: *See the place. He ſaith directly, that we are iuſtified, and that this iuſtice doth increaſe, whiles it doth proceede and profit.*

Gen. 22.

Lib. 83 Queſt. q. 76.

Ser. 16. de verb. Apoſt.

## R. Abbot.

The exhortation of *S. Iohn* is, that he that hath walked in righteouſneſſe and innocencie, and thereby approoued his profeſſion of the faith of Chriſt, ſhould ſtill continue his courſe, and go forward to iuſtifie and approue himſelfe to the conſciences of all men, by the ſame vertuous and godly life. The words haue their reference to outward conuerſation, & iuſtification is to be vnderſtood of the ſame that *S. Iames* ſpeaketh of, & that is before men, and in example of outward life. To inward holineſſe and purity the other part of the ſentence is to be referred, *He that is holy, let him be ſanctified ſtill,* that is, let him adde to his ſanctification, let him be more and more renewed, let him ſtill be [a] *putting off the old man, and putting on the new;* let him ſtill [b] *cleanſe himſelfe from all defilement of the fleſh and of the ſpirit, and finiſh (or perfect) his ſanctification in the feare of God.*

a Ephe. 4. 22. 24.
b 2. Cor. 7. 1.

S. Iohn

S. Iohn wold not by both thoſe ſpeeches import one thing, & therfore ſeeing the latter without doubt importeth inward righteouſneſſe, the other muſt needes be applied to outward works. As for that of Eccleſiaſticus it is nothing to vs, who admit no canonicall authoritie of that booke; yet it proueth nothing for *M. Biſhop* nor againſt vs, the words truely tranſlated being theſe: [c] *deferre not till death to be iuſtified*; that is, put not off till death to repent & to ſeek forgiueneſſe of thy ſinnes, according to that which in the former verſe he hath ſaid; [d] *Humble thy ſelf before thou be ſick, & whileſt thou maieſt yet ſinne, ſhew thy conuerſion.* Here is nothing at all to proue two iuſtifications in that ſenſe that we here ſpeak of, as whereby a man being firſt iuſt, becõmeth more iuſt before the iudgement ſeat of God. Increaſe and growth of inherent righteouſneſſe wee acknowledg & require in all faithfull Chriſtians, & his paines is idlely beſtowed in the proof therof. We know what our Sauiour ſaith, [e] *Euerie one that beareth fruit in me the Father purgeth, that he may bring forth more fruit*; what *S. Peter* exhorteth, [f] *to grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt.* We teach men to ſay with *S. Paul:* [g] *Not as though I had already attained or were already perfect, but one thing I do; I forget that which is behind & endeauour my ſelfe to that which is before, & follow hard toward the marke, &c.* We teach with *S. Bernard;* [h] *In the way of life not to go forward, is to go backward*, and againe, [i] *not to increaſe is to decreaſe;* [k] *where a man beginneth not to care to be better, there he giueth ouer being good at all.* Hee neede not therefore to proue this matter vnto vs, who teach it much more faithfully & carefully then they do. The place of *Iames* proueth no other iuſtification but what we confeſſe, that is, an approuing & declaring of his faith and iuſtification. His works are a teſtimonie that the Scripture hath truely and rightlie ſaid of him, [l] *Abraham beleeued God, & it was imputed vnto him for righteouſnes.* Now *M. Biſhop* ſhold haue told vs in what other meaning it can be taken, that *S. Iames* ſaith, that in his works *the Scripture was fulfilled, that ſaith, Abraham beleeued God, and it was imputed vnto him for righteouſneſſe.* For if his workes were but the fulfilling of that Scripture, how abſurdlie doth Maſter *Biſhop* goe about to prooue in his workes an augmentation of that which by that Scripture is imported formerly to bee done? Jf his workes were but the fulfilling of that that was ſaid of his iuſtification before, how doth hee

c Eccleſ. 18. 21.

d Ver. 20.

e Ioh. 15. 2.

f 2. Pet. 3. 18.

g Phil. 3. 12.

h Bernard in Paraſ. ſer. 3. *In via vitæ non progredi eſt regredi.*

i Epiſt. 123. *Nolle proficere eſt deficere.*

k Epiſt. 91. *Vbi incipis nolle fieri melior, ibi etiam deſinis eſſe bonus.*

l Iam. 2. 23.

thereby seeke to proue a second iustification? Now the former testimonie of his iustification is to be considered, which was long after Gods first calling of him, [m] when he had shewed his singular faith and obedience vnto God, in going out of his own country at the word of God, when he had long called vpon the name of the Lord, built many altars vnto him, done him much seruice: when he had long trauelled from place to place vnder his protection. For after all this, yet was he not iustified by his works, but onely of his [n] *beleeuing the Lord*, it is testified, that *it was imputed vnto him for righteousnesse*. We would haue *M. Bishop* to tell vs, whether *Abraham* before the time that this testimony was giuen him, were a iustified man or not? he cannot denie it, because *Abraham* had done many good works: & he hath before said, that there can be *no good workes before the first iustification*. If he were iustified before, then it appeareth, that to a man alreadie iustified, not his workes, but his faith is counted for righteousnes; and because it cannot be thought that by one meanes he was iustified before, and by another now, it must needs be, that as before to be iustified, so now still beeing iustified, his faith is counted to him for righteousnesse, according as it is written: [o] *The iust shall liue by faith*. Now if after he were iustified, he did continue still to be iustified by faith, then to speake properlie as we do of iustification in the sight of God, there is one onlie iustification whereby a mans [p] *faith is imputed to him for righteousnesse*, as the Apostle speaketh. It must needes therefore follow that *S. Iames* speaketh of iustification in some other meaning then the Apostle *S. Paul* doth: what that meaning is let him learne, not of vs, but of the ancient Church: [q] *Had Abraham no workes?* (saith *Photius*) *God forbid. Verily he had workes, so as that if hee had beene brought in iudgement with the men with whom hee liued, he had easily beene iustified, and preferred before them: but that by his works hee should bee iustified before God, as worthie of the dignity, kindnesse, and gift that was yeelded vnto him, he would neuer haue attained to it, but he had it by faith onely. Heereby*, saith he, *the resolution is manifest, how* Saint Paul *saith, that* Abraham *was iustified by faith, and* Saint Iames, *that he was iustified by workes*. Heere is a plaine distinction and difference deliuered, that *Saint Paul* saith, that by faith only a man is iustified before God: but that it is before men, & with men that *S. Iames* meaneth a man is iustified by works. And this distin-

m Gen. 12. & seq.

n Gen. 15. 6.

o Hab. 2. 4.

p Rom. 4. 5.

q *Phot. apud Oecumen. in Rom. cap. 4. Non habuit Abraham opera? abs. Opera siquidem habuit, vt si cum hominibus qui simul cum eo versabantur fuisset in iudicio constitutus facilè iustificatus fuisset, illisque antepositus: verum vt coram Deo ex suis operibus iustificaretur tanquam dignus & aequalis sese prebens dignitatis cum ea quae inde præbebatur beneficentiæ & donorum quam fuisset illam assecutus. Vnde ergo his dignus est habitus? ex sola fide, &c. Solutio patet ex his quomodo hic quidem (Paulus) ex fide vt iustificatum fuisse Abraham, dixit autem Iacobus ex operibus.*

diſtinction is very plainly intimated by *S. Paul*, when he ſaith, [r] *If Abraham were iuſtified by workes, he had to reioice, but not with God.* He denieth not but *Abraham* was iuſtified by workes, and that he had wherein to glory, and to ſtand vpon his iuſtification, but yet *not with God.* Hee might do it in reſpect of men, but *with God* hee could not do it. So ſaith *Origen* vpon thoſe words, hauing firſt put difference betwixt iuſtification by faith ſeene onely to God, and iuſtification by works *which may be approued of men:* [s] *If Abraham were iuſtified by works, he hath the glory which commeth by works, but not that which is with God.* And this diſtinction is apparant alſo by *S. Auſtine*, who ſpeaking as touching inherent iuſtice and righteouſneſſe of workes, ſaith, [t] *So long as we liue in this life, no mã is iuſtified; but in the ſight of God. Not without cauſe was it that Dauid added, In thy ſight: For it may be that a man may be iuſtified in the ſight of men; but let him ſpeake as touching Gods ſight, and no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified in thy ſight.* Where ſith *S. Auſtine* as touching iuſtification by works, denieth that any man in this life is iuſtified in the ſight of God, it muſt neceſſarily follow that that iuſtification which is by workes, muſt not be vnderſtood in the ſight of God, but onely in the ſight of men. Now then to ſpeake of iuſtification before men, as *S. Iames* doth, it is true that both faith and works do concurre and ioine in the act of iuſtification. The faith that inwardly in the heart iuſtifieth to God, and is outwardly profeſſed with the mouth to men, is not ſufficient to approoue a man outwardly to men, and to the Church of God, to the ſight and conſcience whereof, euery faithfull man is bound to acquit and cleare himſelfe, vnleſſe it bee accompanied and adorned with vertuous and vpright conuerſation. In this reſpect therefore it may be ſaid, that the better part in ſome ſort is attributed to workes, that faith is made perfect by workes; that faith is as the body and good workes as the ſoule, and that faith without workes is dead, euen as the body is dead without the ſoule. Men ſpecially haue an eie to works, and thereto attribute more then to words. Hee is taken for a halting and halfe Chriſtian, that maketh ſhew of faith, and liueth not accordingly. Men account him as a carion, a dead carkaſſe, loathſome, & deteſtable; he is euery mans by word, as I ſaid before, & his name continually carrieth reproach with it. Hereby it appeareth alſo, that faith though haply it be in the heart, yet is here re-

[r] Rom. 4. 2.

[s] Origen. in Rom. ca. 4. Abraham ſi ex operibus iuſtifica. w eſt habet quidem gloriam ex operibus veniem em ſed non ad ꝑ quæ apud Deũ eſt.

[t] Aug. de Temp. ſer. 49. Quamdiu viuitur in hac vita n. mo iuſtificatus eſt, ſed In conſpectu Dei Non fruſtra additur, In conſpectu tuo: niſi quia poteſt eſſe iuſtificatus in conſpectu hominum. Reſert in conſpectu Dei: Non iuſtificabitur in conſpectu tuo omnis viuens.

ſpected onely as it is profeſſed to men. For it cannot bee that the worke of the hand ſhould giue life to the faith of the heart, but rather receiueth life from it. Yea, *M. Biſhop* himſelfe telleth vs, that charity within is the life of faith within, and therefore works which are without cannot be ſaid to be the life of faith, but as faith it ſelfe alſo is without. There may be workes whereby a man outwardly may[u] *iuſtifie himſelfe to men*, as the Phariſees did, which yet are dead works, becauſe there is neither faith nor charity to giue them life from the heart. Now *S. Iames* muſt ſo be vnderſtood, as that not charity which is habitually & inuiſibly within, but works which are outward and apparent, muſt be the life of faith. He ſpeaketh therefore of faith, as it is outwardly profeſſed, which hath it life, and grace, and honour amongſt men by the outward fruits of good workes correſpondent to it ſelfe. Very guilefully therefore doth *M. Biſhop* turne his ſpeech from workes whereof *S. Iames* ſpeaketh, to charity, there being here ſo different a conſideration to be had of the one and of the other; yea, he himſelfe naming *charity the fountaine of good workes*, and thereby importing that *charity as the fountaine* differeth from the good workes that iſſue therefrom. The place that he alledgeth to the Corinthians, [x] *Though I haue all faith, &c.* is nothing to this purpoſe, becauſe wee ſpeake here of *a faith* that is common to all the faithfull, but the Apoſtle there ſpeaketh of a faith that is peculiar onely to ſome, whereof he hath ſaid in the chapter going before, [y] *To one is giuen the word of wiſedome, to another the word of knowledge, to another is giuen faith*, meaning the *faith* whereby miracles are wrought, as he himſelfe addeth, *Though I haue all faith, ſo that I could remoone mountaines, &c.* His purpoſe is to teach men not to bee proud of ſpeciall gifts of the ſpirit, but to reſpect the end and vſe thereof, which is performed by loue, without which they are onely idle ſhewes. As touching the compariſon of faith and charity, there hath beene enough ſaid[z] before. For our preſent ſtate faith hath the preferment, and all in all hangeth vpon our faith, which is the heart and life of whatſoeuer elſe is in vs towards God. It is faith that giueth God his glory, that acknowledgeth him to be that that hee is; that ſo ſetteth him before vs, as to draw all our affections vnto him, our loue, our feare, our hope, our delight, our ſelues wholy both body and ſoule. The promiſes of God in ſpeciall manner are made to them

u Luk. 16. 15.

x 1. Cor. 13. 2.

y Cap. 12. 9. 10.

z Sect. 21.

them that beleeue and truſt in him. Therefore that God eſteemeth more of our charity then of our faith, is not the Apoſtles aſſertion, but *M. Biſhops* fond collection, and that which the whole courſe of Scripture doth gainſay. But ſuppoſing it to be ſo, the conſequence that *M. Biſhop* draweth therefrom is very ridiculous: *If God eſteem more of charity then of our faith, a man is more iuſtified by charity, then by faith.* As if he ſhould ſay, A man eſteemeth more of his eies then of his eares, therefore he heareth better with his eies then with his eares. A thing may ſimply and abſolutly be preferred before another, and yet the other in ſome reſpect & vſe may be preferred before it. Thus may it very well be ſaid as touching this compariſon of faith with charity as before is ſaid. Further he alleageth, that God *to ſhew how acceptable Abrahams fact was to him, ſaith, Now I know that thou loueſt me.* The true text is, [a]*Now I know that thou feareſt me:* but thus *M. Biſhop* ſhufleth and ſhifteth the beſt he can, to gaine ſomwhat to charity againſt faith: but this is nothing to his purpoſe howſoeuer. It pleaſeth God who knoweth the heart & whatſoeuer is within vs, yet to take vpon him the knowledge of our loue, faith, feare, &c. by the fruits thereof. Hereby he will try vs, he will approue vs, and giue teſtimony & witneſſe vnto vs, and ſo ſhall he do at the laſt day. But what will *Biſhop* inferre hereof? If that that hee would proue be that that hee ſaith, that it was acceptable vnto God, wee will eaſily grant him ſo much, and ſo ſend him backe againe as wiſe as he came. If he would proue heereby that *Abraham* was iuſtified before God by his works, let him conſider his argument well, God tooke knowledge of *Abrahams* fearing him by his works; therefore *Abraham* was iuſtified by works in the ſight of God. But if we follow the conſtruction that S. *Auſtin* often maketh of thoſe words, this collectiō wil appeare much more abſurd. [b]*God*, as he ſaith, *knoweth all things before they come to paſſe.* It was not now that God firſt knew that *Abraham* feared him. Therefore as [c]*the ſpirit* is ſaid, *to pray and groane*, becauſe *he maketh vs to pray and groane*, ſo he ſaith, that *God is ſaid to know* when as *hee maketh vs to know.* [d] *Now I know* then is as much as if he had ſaid, *Now I haue made thee to know, or I haue made it to be knowne that thou feareſt me.* *M. Biſhops* argument then is come to this, God made *Abraham* to know by his worke in offering his ſonne *Iſaac*, that he was one indeed that feared God; therfore *Abraham* was iuſtified by his works

a Gen. 22. 12.

b *Auguſt. cont. Maximin. lib. 3. ca. 19.*

c *Gemere dicitur ſpiritus qui nos gemere facit, ſicut dixit Deus, Nunc cognoui, quando cognoſcere hominē fecit.*

d *Ibid lib. 1. Nunc cognoui. id eſt, nunc cognoſcere te feci. & de Geneſ. ad lit. lib. 4. cap. 9. feci vt cognoſceretur.*

in the ſight of God. But he will now *conuince all obſtinate cauilling*, ..d to that end ſaith, that it is ſaid, that *Abrahams faith in this fact did cooperate with his works, and that the worke made his faith perfect.* And what of that? *This connection of them both together, doth demonſtrate that he ſpeaketh of his iuſtification before God.* This is as he ſaid before, *iuſt as Germaines lips, nine mile aſunder.* He ioineth faith and works together, therefore hee ſpeaketh of iuſtification before God. The argument much better ſerueth vs; If he had ſpoken of iuſtification before God, as S. *Paul* doth, hee would haue ſpoken of faith only as he doth: but becauſe he ioineth faith and works together, it plainely appeareth, that he ſpeaketh not of the ſame iuſtification, whereof *S. Paul* ſpeaketh, and therefore muſt be vnderſtood of iuſtification before men. Well, his friends are beholding to him for his good wil, but he is able to ſtand them in little ſteede. Yet to helpe the matter, *it is added*, ſaith he, *and he was called the friend of God.* But why did hee not alleadge the whole text, *Abraham beleeued in God, and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſſe, and he was called the friend of God*, and ſo conclude thereof, therefore he was iuſtified by his works in the ſight of God? He might as well inferre it of the one as of the other; and if the one part of the ſentence be againſt his purpoſe, what ſenſe was there in him to ſeeke for it in the other? The meaning is euident and plaine, that it appeared hy *Abrahams* obedience and works, that it was not without cauſe ſaid of him, *Abraham beleeued God, and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſſe, and that he was called the friend of God.*[e] *The tree is knowne by his fruits*, and *Abraham* by his fruites is iuſtified, and proued to be a good tree. Now it is not hereby onely declared, that he was iuſt before man, as this wrangler cauilleth, but it is heereby declared vnto men, that he truely beleeued, and by his faith was iuſtified before God. To bee ſhort, in the text there is not ſo much as one word, or peece of word, whereby Maſter *Biſhop* can make it good, that Saint *Iames* ſpeaketh of iuſtification in the ſight of God. But becauſe the text will not, Saint *Auſtine* is brought to proue it, who ſpeaketh neuer a word to that effect. *M. Biſhop* very lewdly falſifieth his words, and maketh him to ſay that which hee doth not ſay, nor euer meant to ſay. Hee ſpeaketh the idle dreames of his owne head, and propoundeth them to his Reader vnder Saint *Auſtines* name.

e Mat. 12. 33.

The

The very words of *Auſtin* are theſe: [f] *The ſentences of the two Apoſtles Paul and Iames are not contrarie one to the other, when the one ſaith, that a man is iuſtified by faith without works, and the other ſaith, that faith without workes is vaine, becauſe the one ſpeaketh of workes that goe before faith, the other of works which follow faith* Here is no mention of firſt or ſecond iuſtification, nor ſo much as the name of *iuſtification by workes*, much leſſe any expounding of the meaning of it; not a ſyllable in all that Chapter, whence he ſhold deriue that meaning of iuſtification, which he ſetteth downe for *Auſtins to bee made more and more iuſt*. Nay, I remember not in my reading, that *Auſtin* any where in any meaning affirmeth iuſtification by works, but onely in his *Hypognoſticon*, the words whereof are before handled: which worke though we commonly cite vnder *Auſtins* name, yet there is no man much conuerſant in *Auſtin*, but will eaſily conceiue by the phraſe and ſtile, that it is none of his, to ſay nothing, that in his Retractions he maketh no mention of it. The words that here he ſpeaketh out of *S. Iames* are, that *faith is vaine without works*, hereby willing it to be vnderſtood, that though faith do iuſtifie without any works going before, yet where it iuſtifieth, it hath alwaies good workes thenceforth accompanying it, and that that faith which is not thus accompanied with good works, is not [g] *that healthfull or ſauing faith which the Goſpell commendeth*, nor doth iuſtifie him in whom it is: [h] *For he that is iuſtified by faith*, ſaith he, *cannot but thenceforth worke righteouſly, though he attaine to iuſtification whit hout hauing wrought any thing righteouſly before.* The intent that *S. Iames* had in alleadging the example of *Abraham*, he noteth to be this, [i] *to ſhew that good works enſued or followed his faith.* The drift of his ſpeech is againſt them, who [k] *ſo tooke it to be ſaid (by faith without workes) as that they thought, that when once they had beleeued in Chriſt, albeit they wrought euill, and liued wickedly and leudly, yet they might be ſaued by faith.* The error of theſe men he reformeth thus: [l] *It is not ſo to be vnderſtood, (that a man is iuſtified by faith without works) as that hauing receiued the faith, if he liue, we ſhould call him iuſt, although he liue amiſſe.* By which phraſe of *receiuing the faith* it appeareth, that there is onely that *faith* heere meant which conſiſteth in outward profeſſion & receiuing of baptiſme, which is farre from that faith to which the holy Scripture attributeth iuſtification and ſaluation. In all which ſpeech *S. Auſtine* ſaith nothing

f *Auguſt lib. 83. quæſt 70. Non ſunt tibi contrariæ diuinum Apoſtolorum ſententiæ Pauli & Iacobi, cùm dicit vnus iuſtificari hominem per fidem abſque operibus; & alius dicit inanem eſſe fidem ſine operibus, quia ille dicit de operibus quæ fidem præcedunt, hic de iis quæ fidem ſequuntur.*

g *Auguſt. de fide & oper. cap. 14. Salutari illa plane neque Euangelica.*

h *Lib. 83. quæſt. vt ſuprà. Nam iuſtificatus per fidem non poteſt, niſi iuſte deinceps operari, quamuis nihil antea operatus iuſtè ad iuſtificationem peruenerit.*

i *Fidem eius bona opera conſecuta eſſe demonſtrat.*

k *Qui ſic acceperunt dictum (per fidem ſine operibus) vt putarent, cùm ſemel in Chriſtum credidiſſent, etiamſi malè operarentur & ſegnitiosè ac ſacinoroſè viuerent ſaluos ſe eſſe poſſe per fidem.*

l *Non ita intelligendum eſt vt acceptâ fide ſi viuxerit, dicamus eum iuſtum etiamſi malè vixerit.*

nothing againſt vs, nothing which we auouch not as well as he, but onely that vnder the name of *iuſtification*, he containeth not only *forgiueneſſe of ſins*, wherein *iuſtification* properly conſiſteth, but that alſo which we diſtinctly call *ſanctification*, conſiſting in the inward renewing of vs to holineſſe and righteouſnes, which the Scripture plainely diſtinguiſheth as we doe. In the other place alleadged, he notably oppugneth that which *M. Biſhop* would faine maintaine. He toucheth three things appertaining to our ſaluation, which towards it, we haue already attained; *Predeſtination, vocation, iuſtification.* Of this laſt he ſaith, [m] *What is meant by being iuſtified? Dare we ſay, that we haue this third thing already? And is there any man that dares ſay, I am iuſt? for I thinke it to be all one to ſay, I am iuſt, as to ſay, I am no ſinner. If thou be bold ſo to ſay, S. Iohn meeteth with thee ſaying, If we ſay we haue no ſinne, wee deceiue our ſelues, &c. what then? haue we not hing of right eouſneſſe, or haue we? But yet we haue not all. Let vs then ſeeke after this: for if we haue ſome part, and ſome part wee haue not, let that increaſe which we haue, and that ſhall be implied which wee haue not.* He plainely confeſſeth that by that iuſtification which he ſpeaketh of, we haue but ſomewhat of inherent righteouſneſſe, and that we haue ſtill ſomewhat of ſinne, and therefore that we are not as yet ſo iuſt by that iuſtification, as that thereby we may ſtand for iuſt in the ſight of God, becauſe we cānot ſtand for iuſt in his ſight before whom perforce we muſt confeſſe our ſelues to bee ſinners. But *M. Biſhop* teacheth farre otherwiſe, as wee haue ſeene before, that a man by baptiſme is made as voide of ſinne as *Adam* was in the ſtate of innocency, and therefore hath no need greatly to feare the rigorous ſentence of a iuſt iudge. Now of that righteouſneſſe that we haue S. *Auſtin* ſaith, that it is to grow and increaſe, that wee [n] *are to be thankefull for that we haue, that that may be added which we haue not, &c.* We teach in the like ſort, but yet withall we teach as he doth, that it neuer ſo farre increaſeth in this life, but that it leaueth vs ſtill to confeſſe our ſelues ſinners, and therefore that it neuer bringeth vs to that, as that we can thereby be iuſtified in the ſight of God. This is the point. Increaſe of inward and inherent righteouſneſſe we ſay there ought to be, and is: no man doubteth, no man maketh queſtion of it; but wee denie that wee merit any iuſtification by our workes, or grow by our owne righteouſneſſe, to be reputed iuſt before the iudgement ſeat of God, neither doth

Saint

m *Aug. de ver. Apoſt. Ser. 16. Quid eſt iuſtificari? Audemus dicere, tam hoc tertium habere nos? Et erit quiſquam noſtrum qui audeat dicere, Iuſtus ſum? Puto enim hoc eſſe, Iuſtus ſum, quod eſt, Peccator non ſum. Siaudes hoc dicere, occurrit tibi Ioannes, ſi dixerimus, &c. Quid ergo? Nihil habemus de iuſtitia, an habemus? ſed non totum habemus. Hoc ergo quæramus, &c.*

n *Ibid Gratiſſimus ex eo quod habemus, vt addatur quod non habemus.*

Saint *Auſtine* euer affirme the ſame.

## 37. W. Bishop.

*Nothing then is more certain and cleare, then that our iuſtification may daily bee augmented: and it ſeemeth to me, that this alſo bee granted in their opinion. For they holding faith to bee the onely inſtrument of iuſtification cānot deny, but that there are many degrees of faith, it is ſo plainely taught in the word*: O ye of little faith! *And then a little after*, I haue not found ſo great faith in Iſrael: *and*, O Lord increaſe our faith, *and many ſuch like, where many different degrees of faith are mentioned. How then can the iuſtificatiō which depends vpō that faith not be correſpondent vnto that diuerſitie of faith, but allone? Againe*, Maſter Perkins *deliuereth plainely*, That men at the firſt are not ſo well aſſured of their ſaluation, as they are afterward: *if then in the certainty of their ſaluation, which is the prime effect of their iuſtification, they put degrees, they muſt perforce allow them in the iuſtification it ſelfe. And thus much of this queſtion. The obiections which* M. Perkins *makes for vs in this Article, do belong either to the queſtion of merits or of the poſſibilitie of fulfilling the law, or to the perfection of our iuſtice: and therfore I remit them to thoſe places: and wil handle the two latter points, before I come to that of merits.*

Mat. 8. Luc. 19.

Pag. 54.

Pag. 101.

## R. Abbot.

That inherent righteouſneſſe may bee increaſed wee confeſſe, but wee deny that our iuſtification before God conſiſteth therein, but onely in the merit and obedience of Chriſt, which needeth no increaſe, becauſe it is fully abſolute and perfect in euery reſpect in it ſelfe. But *Maſter Biſhop* according to his ignorance, telleth vs that there muſt needs bee diuers degrees of iuſtification in our meaning, becauſe there are diuers degrees of faith, and diuers degrees of aſſurance of ſaluation. But wee anſwer him, that that neceſſary followeth not, becauſe although the inſtrument whereby wee receiue, is in ſome ſtronger, and in ſome weaker, yet the thing receiued is one and the ſame to both. The price of redemption in the ſhedding of the bloud of Chriſt, is one and alike to all and euery faithfull man, but yet it is

is not alike apprehended by euery one. There is perfect righteouſnes required of vs, and the ſame is yeelded vnto vs in Chriſt. There may be a difference in vs, but Chriſt cannot be diuided, neither is there in him any differeuce from himſelfe. Where he goeth, he goeth whole; and therefore what he is to the ſtrong, the ſame is hee to the faint and feeble ſoule. There is greater aſſurance and leſſe aſſurance, but the matter wherof each doth take aſſurance, is the whole mercy of God in Chriſt.

## 38 W. Bishop.

*Whether it be poſsible for a man in grace, to fulfill Gods law.*

Pag 95. Maſter Perkins *argueth, that it is vnpoſsible: firſt*, for that *Paule* tooke it for his ground, that the law could not bee fulfilled.

Gal.5. *Admit it were ſo.* I then would anſwer, that he ment, that a man helped onely with the knowledge of the lawe, cannot fulfill the law: but by the ayde of Gods grace, he might be able to do it. *Which I*

Rom.8. *gather out of* S. Paule, *where he ſaith, that* that which was vnpoſsible to the lawe, is made by the grace of Chriſt poſsible.

2 *Obiect.* The liues and works of moſt righteous men, are imperfect and ſtained with ſinne; ergo *quid?* Of this there ſhall bee a ſeuerall Article.

3 *Obiect.* Our knowledge is imperfect, and therefore our faith, repentance, and ſanctification is anſwerable. *I would to God all our workes were anſwerable to our knowledge, then would they bee much more perfect then they are. but this argument is alſo impertinent, and doth rather proue it poſsible to fulfil the law, becauſe it is poſsible to know all the law. Then if our works be anſwerable to our knowledge, we may alſo fulfill it.*

4 *Obiect.* A man regenerate, is partly fleſh, and partly ſpirit, and

Rom.8.13. therefore his beſt works are partly from the fleſh. *Not ſo, if we mortifie the deedes of the fleſh by the ſpirit, as the Apoſtle exhorteth.*

## R. Abbot.

The denial of the poſsibility of keeping Gods commandement, or of fulfilling the law is not abſolutely meant. God forbid, that we ſhould ſay, that God hath commanded any thing vnpoſsible to

be

bee done. Wee beleeue that *Adam* was created in ſtate to fulfill all the righteouſneſſe of the law. We beleeue that Chriſt in our nature hath fulfilled the ſame for vs, and that we by Chriſt in the end ſhal fullie be reſtored to the perfection thereof. Jn the meane time alſo we keep the commandements of God, and frame our liues according to the line and rule thereof, and heerein we labour and trauell to grow and increaſe from day to daie: but we attaine not to perfection heere; that which we do is more in will then in work; more in deſire then in deede. In the midſt of our righteouſneſſe we condemne our ſelues of ſin; we carry our vncleanneſſe in our hands, and thereby do yeeld confeſſion thereof to the Lord: if we will ſay that we fulfill the law, our owne mouth ſhall condemne vs, who accordingly as we are taught do daily aske forgiuenes for our tranſgreſſions of the law. There is no man ſo long as hee liueth, but muſt confeſſe, that hee is too weake to the bearing of that burthen, and commeth much ſhort euery maner of way of that that is required by the law. And this *S. Paul* tooke indeede for the ground of his whole diſputation againſt iuſtification by the law. For rightly hee ſaith: [a] *If there had beene a law giuen which could haue giuen life, then righteouſnes ſhold haue been by the law.* He taketh it for granted, that the law could not giue life, not be cauſe it was defectiue in it ſelfe, but becauſe by our defect we were not capeable of the life that was offered thereby; euen as the Sunne cannot giue light to the blind, not for any want that is in it, but becauſe the blind hath not meanes to make benefit and vſe of the light that moſt cleerely ſhineth from the Sunne. Which reaſon the Apoſtle more plainely declareth otherwhere, when he ſaith, that [b] *it was impoſſible for the law* (namely, to iuſtifie and ſaue vs) *becauſe it was weakned by the fleſh.* Whereby hee ſignifieth, that the default reſteth vpon our weakneſſe and the corruption of our ſinfull fleſh, whereby wee are vnable in any ſort to attaine to that righteouſneſſe, and perfect integritie and innocencie that the law requireth of vs. Now if fleſh doe hinder the law from being able to iuſtifie vs, then ſo long as fleſh continueth, there muſt needs be ſtill a weakneſſe of the law in that behalfe. But ſo long as here we liue there is ſtill [c] *the fleſh luſting againſt the ſpirit*, and [d] *rebelling againſt the law of the mind.* Wee can neuer therefore whileſt wee liue attaine to the fulfilling of the lawe to bee iuſtified thereby. This remainder of fleſh doth argue, that wee haue yet receiued

[a] Gal. 3. 21.

[b] Rom. 8. 3.

[c] Gal. 5. 17.

[d] Rom. 7. 23.

ceiued the grace of God, but onlie in part. It hath begun to heale vs, but a great part of our diſeaſe and weakneſſe continueth ſtill. We are therefore as yet but in part only enabled thereby to fulfill the law, and if we keepe it but in part, we keepe it not ſo as to bee iuſtified by the law, becauſe by the ſentence of the law, [e] *curſed is euerie man that continueth not in all things that are written therein.*

e Gal. 3. 10.

This meaning the Apoſtle plainly deliuereth, neither doth *M. Biſhop* gather any other meaning from him, but by the corrupting of his words; alleadging him, as if he had ſaid: *That that was impoſſible to the law, is made by the grace of Chriſt poſſible.* But why doth he put in that vnder the Apoſtles name, which the Apoſtle doth not ſay? he neither ſaith, nor meant to ſay, that to fulfill the law, *is made poſſible by the grace of Chriſt*, but rather that in Chriſt that iuſtification is ſupplied vnto vs, which it is vnpoſſible ſhould be yeelded vnto vs by the law. And how could hee gather that meaning from him, when he could not but knowe, that notwithſtanding the grace of Chriſt, he affirmeth ſtill in part a remainder of that impediment by which it was vnpoſſible before to fulfill the law. But of this text there will bee further occaſion to ſpeake in the three and fortieth ſection. The ſecond reaſon alleadged by *M. Prkins* againſt the opinion of fulfilling of the law, is that *the liues and workes of the moſt righteous men are vnperfect and ſtained with ſinne.* *M. Biſhop* verie quipperly demandeth, *Ergo quid?* he knew the ergo well inough, *Ergo* no man can fulfill the law. For if the moſt righteous faile in that behalfe, then it followeth, that generally all are excluded from that power. If all muſt confeſſe themſelues to be *vnperfect*, if al muſt acknowledge themſelues to be ſinners, then all muſt confeſſe, as I ſaid before, that they faile of the performance of the law. The connexion would haue been conſidered here, but *M. Biſhop* pretily paſſeth it ouer vnder pretence of a ſeuerall article, for the handling of the propoſition: what he ſaith of that we ſhall ſee anon *M. Perkins* third reaſon is taken from the imperfection of our knowledge: for it cannot be but our faith, our loue, our repentance, our ſanctificatiō muſt be vnperfect, ſo long as we haue but vnperfect knowledge to direct vs in all theſe things. *M. Biſhops* anſwer to this conſiſteth of two parts: the one whereof is an acknowledgement againſt himſelfe, the other, an aſſertion of apparent and manifeſt vntruth. *I would to God* (ſaith hee) *our workes were anſwerable to our knowledge,*

*ledge, then would they be much more perfect then they be.* He confeſſeth then, that our workes are not perfect, according to that that we do know; and if they be vnperfect to that knowledge that we haue, and our knowledge come farre ſhort of that concerneth vs by the lawe, then muſt our workes be very farre from perfection, and we farre from being truly ſaid to fulfill the law. But *M. Biſhop* according to his skill denieth in the ſecond part of his anſwer, that our knowledge is vnperfect, expreſly contrarie to that which the Apoſtle ſaith: [f] *We know in part, we propheſie in part, we ſee through a glaſſe darkely.* We find it and know it, that there are many ignorances and errors in the beſt. [g] *We all* (ſaith *S. Anſtine*) *offend in many things, whileſt we thinke that that which we do either pleaſeth God, or doth not diſpleaſe him, when as afterwards we learne, that it is not pleaſing vnto him, and do repent thereof.* [h] *He that knoweth thee,* (ſaith he in another place) *loueth thee more then himſelfe, and leaueth himſelfe to come vnto thee, that he may reioyce in thee. Hence is it, Lord, that I loue thee not ſo much as I ought to do, becauſe I do not fully know thee: becauſe I know thee but a little I loue thee but a little, and therefore do but a little reioyce in thee.* There is no man in this life that knoweth himſelfe, but knoweth well that he hath cauſe to pray ſtill with the prophet *Dauid,* [i] *Teach me thy ſtatutes,* [k] *teach me O Lord the way of thy ſtatuts:* [l] *giue me vnderſtanding that I may learne thy commandements:* [m] *grant me vnderſtanding, that I may know thy teſtimonies.* If ſo great a Prophet were ſtill to be thought, were ſtill to learne, were ſtill begging of God the vnderſtanding and knowledge of his commandements, how vaine a man is *M. Biſhop* to make it ſo poſſible a matter for a man being yet couered in part with the vaile of fleſh, to attaine to the full and perfect knowledge of the law. Of this argument he ſaith, that it is impertinent, but giueth no reaſon why he ſo ſaith. *Saint Auſtine* againſt the aſſertion of perfection in this life [n] produceth imperfection of knowledge as an impediment thereof: and *Hierome* ſaith, [o] *that no man in this body can haue all vertues, becauſe we know but in part, and propheſie but in part,* and if imperfection of knowledg do hinder vertue, and the perfect fulfilling of the law, how doth he make it an argument impertinent to ſay, Our knowledge is yet vnperfect, therefore we are yet vnperfect to the fulfilling of the law. But we muſt pardō his vnperfect knowledg, which if it had bin according to his will,

f 1. Cor. 13. 9. 12

g *Auguſt. de ſpir. & lit. ca. 36. In multis offendimus omnes, dū putamus Deo quem diligimus placere vel non diſplicere quod facimus, & poſtea Cùm didicerimus quòd non placeat pœnitendo deprecamur vt ignoſcat.*

h *Ex dem ſoliloq. cap. 1. Quiſquis cognoſcit te, amat te pluſquā ſe, relinquit ſe & venit ad te, vt gaudeat de te. Hinc eſt, Domine quod non tantùm diligo quantum debeo, quia non plenè cognoſco te. Quia parùm cognoſco, parum diligo, & quia parum te diligo, parum gaudeo in te.*

i Pſal. 119 12.

k Ver. 33.

l Ver. 73.

m Ver. 127.

n *Auguſt. de ſpir. & lit. cap. 36.*

o *Hier. ad Pela. lib. 1. Nullus ſanctorum in iſto corpuſculo tuncEtas poteſt habere virtutes, quia ex parte cognoſcimus, &c.*

will, vndoubtedly we should haue seene some more skill in his answers then now we do. *M. Perkins* fourth and last reason is taken from that that before hath bin said, that the regenerate man in this life is still partly flesh, and not wholly spirituall, and therefore his best workes sauor partly of the flesh. *Not so*, saith *M. Bishop, if we mortifie the deedes of the flesh by the spirit.* But I answer him, Yes euen so, because though by the spirit we mortifie the deedes of the flesh, yea we do not there by put off the flesh, nor so subdue it, but that it
P Gal. 5. 17. P *lusteth against the spirit, so as that we cannot do the things that we would*, and therefore cannot fulfill the law. Now if we attaine not to that that we would, our will also being yet vnperfect, so that we will not so perfectly as we should, how farre must we needes thinke our selues to be from that integritie and vprightnesse, which we should performe according to the perfect rule of righteousnesse that is laid before vs in the law? But of this further when we come to the point as touching the perfection, and purity of our workes.

## 39. W. Bishop.

*But these trifling arguments belong rather vnto the next question. I will helpe* M. Perkins *to some better, that the matter may be more*
Act. 1. 15. *throughly examined.* Why go ye about to put a yoke vpon the Disciples necks, which neither we, nor our Fathers were able to beare? *these words were spoken of the law of* Moyses, *therefore we were not able to fulfill it.*

*I answer first, that that law could not be fulfilled by the onely helpe of the same law, without the further ayde of Gods grace.*

*Secondly, that it was so burdensome and cumberous, by reason of the multitude of their sacrifices, sacraments, and ceremonies, that it could hardly be kept with the helpe of ordinary grace: and in that sense, it is*
Ios. 11. *sayd to be such a yoke, as we were not able to beare. Because things very*
4. Reg. 14. Act. 13. *hard to be done, are now and then called impossible. Now that* Iosue,
4. Reg. 23. Luk. 1. Dauid, Iosias, Zachary, Elizabeth, *and many others, did fulfill all the law, is recorded in holy Scripture: wherefore it is most manifest, that it might be kept.*

## R. Abbot.

A more trifler then *M. Bishop* I thinke is seldome to be found. If

M

*M. Perkins* arguments were as trifling as hee hath giuen them answers, he might haue done well to haue spared his labor bestowed in the writing of that booke. Before hee haue giuen any one good answer to the reasons onely by the way alledged by *M. Perkins*, he taketh vpon him to bring other of his owne indeed out of our books, that he may shew himselfe as wise in answering the one, as hee hath done already in the other. Wee are wont to alledge the words of *S. Peter*, that [a] *the law was a yoke which* (saith he) *neither we nor our Fathers were able to beare.* Whence euen by the very words it must needs follow, that we are not able to fulfill the law. *M. Bishops* answer is, that *that law could not be fulfilled by the onely helpe of the same law, without further ayde of Gods grace.* As though they had not the grace of God, who notwithstanding complained of the law, as of a yoake too heauy for them to beare euen in that state of grace. Therefore we will say to *M. Bishop*, as *Orosius* did to the Pelagian hereticke: [b] *Samuel, Elias, Elizeus, Esay, Ieremy, Daniel, Zachary, all those holy ones either Iudges or Kings, or Prophets were vndoubtedly our Fathers, and Peter affirmeth, that none of the Fathers, no nor themselues, that is, the Apostles being Iewes, could bear the burden of the lawe, but were saued by the faith of Christ according to the help of grace. What, had not all these holy Fathers thinkest thou the help of God?* Hauing then the helpe of the grace of God, yet they still acknowledged the law to be a heauier burthen, then that they were able to stand vnder the waight therof. To this purpose he vrgeth the hereticke with that which is written in the law: [c] *Thou shalt loue the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c.* [d] *Answer*, saith he, *not to me but to God not with thy voice, but with thy conscience, whether thou so loue God with all thy heart, as that thou neuer admit any thought therein, that may be conceiued to be without the feare and loue of God: whether thou so follow him with all thy soule, as that hauing once vndertaken the crosse, thou be neuer caried for the time to fall into any delight or contentment of pleasure, &c.* Where as hee sheweth how far it is beyond our power to keep our selues within the lists & bounds of this commandement: so he taketh away *M. Bishops* second exception, that the law was thus called *a yoke, &c.* in respect of the *sacrifices, sacraments, and ceremonies by the multitude*, whereof hee saith, *that it was so burdensome and comberous, as that it could hardly be kept by the helpe of ordinary grace.* For if the law bee there vnder-

[a] Acts 15.10.

[b] *Oros. Apolog. de arbit. libert. Samuel, Elias, &c. Patres sine dubio nostri sunt & neminem Patrum Petrus affirmat, sed neque semel ipsos, hoc est, Apostolos eli essent Iudei omnes legis ferre potuisse, sed fide Christi secundum spem gratiæ fuisse saluatos. An forte & secundi te omnes isti sancti Patres Dei adiutorium non habebant?*

[c] Deut. 6.7.

[d] *Oros. ibid. Respõde, non mihi sed Deo; non voce sed conscientia, si ita ex toto corde Deũ diligis, vt nullam vnquam in eo cogitationem quæ absque timore & dilectione Dei intelligi possit admittas: ita in tota anima sequeris, vt susceptã semel crucem in nullam penitus oblectationem habita ad tẽpus iocunditatis succedas &c.*

stood, which saith, *Thou shalt loue the Lord thy God, &c*, as *Orosius* declareth, then it is false which *M. Bishop* saith, that that speech is to be referred to the ceremonies of the law. But the reader is well to obserue the manner of his speech: *It could hardly be kept.* It could then or might be kept, though hardly be kept. No question then but some did keepe it if it might be kept. But the yoke of which S. *Peter* speaketh, is such as none was able to beare. It is not then to be vnderstood of the ceremonies of the law. And indeed there is no doubt, but that the ceremoniall law, by ordinary grace of God, as touching the outward practise thereof, might exactly be performed. The multitude of those obseruations is equalled in the Romish Church, and yet they haue nimble fellowes that can attaine to all. But out of *M. Bishops* words we will argue *à minori ad maius*; if the law of ceremonies were so heauy a yoke, which consisted only in outward obseruations, how much heauier is that that giueth law to the whole man, to all his thoughts, and words, and deedes, taking exception against any thing either inwardly or outwardly, whereby we step aside from the rule thereof? And yet hee as a man void of sense & conscience, saith of the ceremonies, that they could very hardly be obserued: but of the rest of the commandements, that they are very possible & easie to be kept, as we shall see anon. In the meane time to proue it, he bringeth exãple of diuers, who he saith *did fulfill all the law*: but hee is preuented and bereaued of those examples by *Cyprian*, who saith of all those excellent men & Priests, and Prophets before Christ, that [e] *being conceiued and borne in sinnes, they were neither without originall nor personall fault, and there was found in them all either ignorance or vnsufficiency, by which going astray they sinned and stood in need of the mercy of God, by which being instructed and restored, they gaue thanks to God, and confessed that much was wanting vnto them to perfection of righteousnesse, and trusting in God presumed not to attribute any soundnes to themselues.* As touching them all, we must answer the same that S. *Austine* answered the Pelagian hereticks: [f] *By the testimonies of the Scripture which we beleeue as touching their commendations, we beleeue this also that no man liuing shall be found iust in the sight of God, and that therefore hee is requested not to enter into iudgement with his seruants.*

e Cyprian. de Zelum. & tent. Christi. Fuerãt & ante Christum viri insignes, Prophetæ Sacerdotes, sed in peccatis concepti & nati, nec originali nec personali exuere delicto, & inuenta est in omnibus vel ignorantia vel insufficientia, in quibus erroni peccauerãt & egerunt miseri cordia Dei, per quam edocti & restituti gratias egerunt Deo, & ad plenitudinem iustitiæ multùm sibi deesse confessi sunt, & confidentes in Deo nullam sibi soliditatẽ attribuere præsumpserunt.

f August. de peccat. merit. & remiss. lib. 2. cap. 14. Scripturarum testimonijs quibus de illorum laudibus credimus, hoc etiam credimus, non iustificari in conspectu Dei omnem viuentem, & ideo regarn ne intret in iudicium cum seruis suis.

Whereby

Whereby what we meane when we request it, the same *S. Austine* sheweth: [g] *Stand not with me in iudgement, by exacting of me all that thou hast commanded, and all that thou hast charged vs. For thou shalt find me guilty if thou enter into iudgement with me.* This S. *Austine* maketh the common confession of all the seruants of God, that they do not fulfil al, and *M. Bishop* saith of them whom he nameth, that they did fulfill all. The Pelagians alledged amongst others, *Zacharie* and *Elizabeth*, as *M. Bishop* doth, because it is said of thē: [h] *Both were iust before God, and walked in all the commandements & ordinances of the Lord without reproofe.* S. *Austin* answereth them, [i] *It is spoken as seemeth to me, as touching a commendable & prayse-worthy conuersation amongst men, which no man could iustly call into quarrell of accusation or crime. Which therefore they are said to haue had before God, because they therin did not deceiue men by any dissimulation, but as they appeared to men, so they were knowne to the eyes of God.* Therfore he maketh of that which was said of them, no more but that which the Apostle saith of himself, [k] *As touching the righteousnesse of the law I was vnrebukable*, when as yet he was not called to the grace of Christ. [l] *What cōmendable thing is spoken of thē*, saith he, *which is not comprehended in that which the Apostle professed of him selfe, when as yet he had not beleeued in Christ, that according to the righteousnesse that is in the law, he was without reproofe.* [m] *In being said in the Scripture to be without crime or reproof*, saith *Orosius*, *is not imported a testimonie of perfection, but an example of conuersation.* It is manifest therefore, that that which is written concerning them, is not to be drawne to the auouching of that fulfilling of the lawe which *M. Bishop* here defendeth for iustification before God. Yea, and it is further to be noted, that *Zachary* was a Priest, and the Priests manner was, [n] *first to offer sacrifice for his owne sinnes, & then for the peoples. Zachary* therefore offered sacrifice for his owne sins. But [o] *sinne is the transgression of the law*: if *Zachary* then were a transgressor of the lawe, it is false that *Master Bishop* saith, that hee *fulfilled the whole law.* Still therefore it standeth good against all subuerters of truth, as touching the morall law, that in respect of iustificatiō it is a *yoke* which neither *Iosue*, nor *Dauid*, nor *Iosias*, nor

g Idem de Tem. Ser. 49. Ne stes mecum in iudicio exigendo à me omnia quæ præcepisti & omnia quæ iussisti. Nā me inuenies reū, si in iudicium intraueris mecum, &c.

h Luk. 1.6.

i Aug. contra Pelag. & Celest. lib. 1. cap. 48. Dictum est quantum mihi videtur secundum quandam inter homines conuersationem probabilē atque laudabilem, quā nullus hominū iustē posset in accusationis & criminationis querelam vocare.

Quam propterea in conspectu Dei habuisse referuntur, quia in ea homines nulla dissimulatione fallebant. sed vt apparebant hominibus ita noti erant oculis Dei.

k Phil. 3. 6.

l Aug. de pecca. mer. & remiss. lib. 2. cap. 13. Quid de illis laudabile dictum est, quod non in to comprehenditur quod de se Apostolus cùm in Christum nondum credidisset professus est, &c.

m Oros. Apo'og. de arbit. libert. Sine crimine dici quenquam & sine querela non est perfectionis testimonium, sed conuersationis exemplum.

n Heb. 7. 27. & 1. Iohn. 3. 4.

*Zacharie* and *Elizabeth*, nor any of thoſe others whom *M. Biſhop* meaneth haue bene able to beare, and therefore wee haue nothing to reſt vpon, but onely the faith of Ieſus Chriſt to bee iuſtified in him.

## 40. W. Biſhop.

To will is in mee, but I finde not how to performe: *If* S. Paule *could not performe that which he would, how can others?*

Rom. 7.

Anſwer. *He ſpeakes there of auoiding all euill motions and temptations which he would willingly haue done, but he could not: marry he could well by the aſſiſtance of Gods grace, ſubdue thoſe prouocations to ſinne, and make them occaſions of vertue: and conſequently keepe all the commandements, not ſuffering thoſe paſſions to leade him to the breach of any one of them. The like anſwer we make vnto that obiection, that one of the ten commandements forbids vs to couet our neighbors goods, his wife, or ſeruants, which (as they ſay) is vnpoſſible: but wee hold, that it may be well done, vnderſtanding the commandement rightly, which prohibiteth not to haue ill motions of couetouſneſſe and lecherie, but to yeeld your conſent vnto them. Now it is ſo poſſible for a man by Gods grace to refraine his conſent from ſuch wicked temptations, that* S. Auguſtine *thinketh it may be done of a mortified vertuous man, euen when he is aſleepe: and teſtifieth of himſelfe, that waking he performed it.*

Lib. 10. conf. cap. 7.

## R. Abbot.

*M. Biſhop* hath a good facility in propounding our arguments, but hee hath very ill hap in anſwering of them. *S. Paul* would *willingly haue auoided all euill motions*, ſaith he, *but he could not.* Therefore ſay we, he could not fulfill the lawe. *He could ſubdue thoſe prouocations to ſinne*, ſaith hee, *and not ſuffer them to leade him to the breach of any of the cõmandements: when, ſay we, the very prouocations themſelues are a breach of the cõmandements.* For what is it whereof the Apoſtle ſaith, as is alledged, [a] *To wil is preſent with mee, but I find not how to performe that that is good?* It is euen the commandement, whereof he hath ſaid before, [b] *The commandement is holy, and iuſt, and good*: for inſtance whereof and clearer euidence, hee ſetteth downe the commandement [c] *Thou ſhalt not luſt*, which he ſtill proſecuteth vnder the name of *good. Paul* then confeſſeth, that though he

a Rom. 7. 18.

b Ver. 12.

c Ver. 7.

he had a will to keepe and fulfill the law, and namely, the commãdement, *Thou ſhalt not luſt*, yet he could not find meanes to attain to that perfection, and why then doth *M. Biſhop* attribute to him, the *keeping of all the cõmandements, ſo as not to be led to the breach of any one of them.*[d] *The law would haue him not to luſt in that it ſaith? Thou ſhalt not luſt; and he was willing not to luſt, but yet he did luſt*; how then ſhould we ſay, that he did fulfill the law? If the law forbid *euill motions and prouocations*, and it is not poſſible for vs to auoid them, or to free our ſelues from them, it muſt follow, that it is not poſſible for vs to fulfill the law. But we forſooth do not *vnderſtand the commandement rightly*, which *M. Biſhop* telleth vs *doth not prohibit euill motions of couetouſneſſe and lecherie, but onely conſent vnto them.* So then the law ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not luſt*, but *M. Biſhop* ſaith; Yes, thou maieſt luſt without any ſinne, but thou maieſt not conſent vnto thy luſt. But farre otherwiſe *S. Auſtine* ſaith, that[e] *the law in ſaying, Thou ſhalt not luſt, doth ſet downe that there ſhall be no concupiſcenſe to be reſtrained and bridled.* Therefore he ſaith: [f] *The perfection of vertue is that which the law ſaith, Thou ſhalt not luſt: this now* (in this life) *cannot be fulfilled.* And againe, [g] *To fulfill the law, is not to luſt: and who is there liuing that can ſo do?* It is manifeſt then by *S. Auſtin*, that that commandement requireth a perfection, which in this world we neuer are able to attaine vnto, becauſe it doth not onely forbid conſent, but euen the very hauing of any euill motions or affections contrary to the law. And by thoſe motions we do not onely breake the commãdement, *Thou ſhalt not luſt*, but we faile of yeelding *loue to God with all our heart, with all our ſoule, &c.* becauſe euil motions & luſts do occupie ſome part of the heart and ſoule, and withhold the ſame from God. Therefore *S. Auſtin* ſaith againe [h] *ſo long as there is any part of carnal concupiſcẽce by continencie to be bridled, God is not perfectly loued with al the ſoule: for the fleſh luſteth not without the ſoule, although the fleſh be ſaid to luſt, becauſe the ſoule luſteth according to the fleſh.* Now therefore albeit it be true, that a man may reſiſt ſuch euil motions, and deny conſent vnto them, yet is he not ther by freed frõ trãſgreſſion of the law. But yet *M. Biſhop* falſely alledgeth *S. Auſtin* to that purpoſe, who in the place [i] cited,

d *Auguſt. de nupt. & concup. lib. 1. cap. 27. Lex non vult vt concupiſcam, quæ dicit, non concupiſces, & ego nilo cõcupiſcere. concupiſcere nolebat, & tamen Concupiſcebat.*

e *Idem Epiſt. 200. In iuſtitia nondum conſummata perſeuerantes proficientes ad eius conſummationem quandoque venimus vita peccati concupiſcentia non cohibenda atque frenanda, ſed nulla ſit. Hoc enim poſuit lex dicendo, Non cõcupiſces.*

f *De Temp. Ser. 45. plenitudo eſt virtutis, quod lex dixit, Ne concupiſcas. Hoc modo implere non poteſt.*

g *Ibid. Ser. 49. Hoc dicit legem implere, hoc eſt, non concupiſcere. Quis ergo hoc, qui viuit, poteſt?*

h *Aug. de perf. iuſt. Cùm eſt aliquid concupiſcẽtiæ carnalis, quod vel continendo frenetur, non omnimodo ex tota anima diligitur deus. Neque enim caro ſine anima concupiſcit, quamuis caro concupiſcere dicatur, quia carnaliter anima concupiſcit.*

i *Auguſt. Confeſſ. lib. 10 cap. 30. Sæpe etiam in ſomnis reſiſtimus, &c. Potens eſt manus tua abundantiore gratia tua lasciuos motus etiam mei ſoporis extinguere, &c. Lugens in eo quod inconſummatus ſum, & ſperans perfectorem te in me miſericordias tuas vſquequo ad pãtem plenitudinem quam habebunt ſecum interiora & exteriora mea cùm abſorpta fuerit mors in victoriam.*

not the seuenth as he quoteth, but the thirtieth Chapter, affirmeth indeed that sometimes men resist those cõcupiscences euen in their sleepe, that it is in Gods power to make him alwaies so to do. He signifieth his longing desire after that puritie and perfection, but his expectation of it onely then, *when death shall be swallowed into victorie*, howsoeuer God be able, if so it were his pleasure, to giue it euen now also in the meane time. And indeed there is no man liuing to whom can be attributed that perfection, to be altogether and wholy free from consent of sinfull lust. There is no man that fighteth so warily, but that sometimes, yea many times he receiueth grieuous wounds, and findeth cause to cry mournfully vnto God for the cure thereof. A man resisteth in one thing, and is ouertaken in another; at one time he checketh those corrupt desires, with which as nets he is strongly intangled at another. This is the state of all flesh, and of this we haue cause to complaine, so long as we liue here.

## 41. W. Bishop.

Iac. 3. 2. 1. Ioan. 1. We do offend in many things: and if we say, we haue no sinne, we deceiue our selues. *But if we could obserue all the law, we should offend in nothing, nor haue any sinne*, ergo.

Answer. *I graunt that we offend in many things: not because it is not possible to keepe them, but for that we are fraile, and easily led by the craft of the diuell into many offences which we may auoyde, if we were so warie and watchfull as we ought to be: againe, although we cannot keepe our selues from veniall offences, yet may we fulfill the law, which is not transgressed and broken, vnlesse we commit some mortall sinnes. For veniall sinnes, either for the smalnesse of the matter, or want of consideration, are not so opposite to the law, as that they violate the reason, and purport of it, although they be somewhat disagreeing with it. But of this matter more fully in some other place.*

## R. Abbot.

There is no doubt, but if all impediments were taken away, whereby we are hindered from keeping the commandements of God, it should be possible enough, perfectly to fulfill the same.

It

It is true which *S. Austine* saith, that [a] *it is not by any default of the lawe that wee fulfill it not, but by default of the wisedome of the flesh*, which as the Apostle saith, is [b] *enmity against God, and is not subiect vnto the Law of God, nor indeede can bee.* Wee are by our frailtie *led into many offences*, (saith *M. Bishop*) *and wee might auoide the same, if wee were so warie and watchfull as wee ought to bee.* But so long as this frailtie hangeth vpon vs, and by the weakenesse and corruption of flesh, wee are not so warie and watchfull as wee ought to be, why doth hee attribute vnto vs a power and ablenesse to fulfill the law? And what is that that hee saith, but euen the deuice of the Pelagian Heretickes, who affirming, [c] *that a man may bee without sinne if hee will*, and *beeing demanded who they were whom they tooke to be without sinne, by a wily shift answered, that they said not what men are, or what they haue beene, but what they may bee.* Euen thus *M. Bishop* beeing vrged by the confession of the Apostles themselues, that in many things wee all offend and sinne, that is, doe trespasse and breake the commandements of God, confesseth it to bee true, but yet notwithstanding saith, that *it is possible to keepe them.* But as *Hierome* answered the Pelagians, so wee answer him, [d] *What a reason is this, that that is possible to be which neuer was, and may bee done, which thou beareſt witnesse that neuer any man did, and to giue to euery man that which in the Patriarkes, and Prophets, and Apostles, thou art not able to make good?* To be short, as it is not possible for a man beeing feeble, and weake, and sicke, to beare a burthen, which notwithstanding being recouered and fully cured, he can beare with ease: so it is not possible for vs, so long as wee are compassed about with corruption and frailtie, to obserue & keepe the lawe and righteousnesse thereof, which yet beeing deliuered from all bondage of corruption and sinne, wee shall easily attaine vnto. His second shift is as absurd as the former, that *though we cannot keepe our selues from venial offences, yet we may fulfill the law, because it is not broken but by mortall sinnes.* But the law it selfe saith, [e] *Cursed is euerie one that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the law to do them.* Therefore concerning all sins the sentence of the Apostle must stand good, that [f] *the wages of sinne is death.* So our Saviour Christ testifieth, [g] *He that breaketh one of the least of these commandements, and teacheth men so, hee shall be called the least in the kingdom of heauen*, that is, saith *S. Austin*, [h] *he shall not enter*

a *Aug. de spir. & lit. cap. 19. Non vitio suo non implebatur lex, sed vitio prudentiæ carnis.*
b Rom. 8. 7.
c *Hieron Epist. ad Ctesiphont. Homines posse esse sine peccato, si velint, &c. Cùm ab eis quæreremus, qui sint quos absq; peccato futent, nouis strophis eludere cupiunt veritatem, se non eos dicere qui sint vel fuerint, sed qui esse possint.*
d *Ibid. Quæ est argumentatio ista posse esse quod nunquam fuerit? Posse fieri quod nullum fecisse testeris? dare nescio cui quod in Patriarchis & Prophetis, & Apostolis fuisse nequeas approbare?*
e Gal. 3. 10.
f Rom. 6. 23.
g Mat. 5. 19.
h *Aug. in Ioan. tract. 122. Consequens est, vt qui minimus est in regno cœlorum, non intret in regnum cœlorum.*

*enter into the kingdom of heauen.* But we will demand of *M. Biſhop*, are thoſe veniall ſinnes forbidden by the law or not? If they be not forbidden, then they are no ſinnes: for[i] *where there is no law, there is no treſpaſſe*, and[k] *ſinne ſhall be no ſinne, if God do not forbid the being of it.* But if they be forbidden, how doth he ſay, that to do them is no tranſgreſſion of the law? for what is it but a tranſgreſſion of the law to do that which the law forbiddeth to be done? The Apoſtle ſaith, that[l] *by the law commeth the knowledge of ſinne.* Veniall ſinnes then by the law are knowne to be ſinnes: how are they knowne to be ſinnes by the law, but that *they violate the reaſon and purport of the law?* But let *S. Iohn* here ſtop *M. Biſhops* mouth: [m] *Whoſoeuer committeth ſinne, tranſgreſſeth alſo the law; for ſinne is the tranſgreſſion of the law.* Veniall ſinne (as he tearmeth it) is ſinne; therefore veniall ſinne is the tranſgreſſion of the law: he therefore that committeth onely thoſe which he calleth veniall ſinnes, cannot be ſaid to fulfill the lawe.

i Rom 4.15.
k Aug. de pecc. mer. & rem. lib. 2. ca. 16. Neque peccatum erit ſi quid erit, ſi non diuinitus iubeatur vt non ſit.
l Rom. 3.20.
m 1 Joh. 3.4.

## 42. W. BISHOP.

*Laſtly, it may bee obiected, that the way to heauen is ſtreight, and the gate narrow: which is ſo true, that it ſeemeth vnpoſſible to bee kept by fleſh and bloud: but that which is impoſſible to men of themſelues, is made poſſible and eaſie too, by the grace of God: which made* Saint Paul *to ſay* I can do all things in him, that ſtrengtheneth and comforteth me: *and the Prophet* Dauid, After thou (O Lord) hadſt dilated my heart (*and with thy grace ſet it at libertie*) I did runne the waies of thy commandements: *that is, I did readily and willingly performe them. Of the louing of God with all our heart, &c. ſhall bee treated in the queſtion of the perfection of iuſtice.*

Phil. 4.
Pſal. 118.

## R. ABBOT.

Heere *M. Biſhop* maketh the commandements of God, not onely poſſible, but *poſſible and eaſie too.* But I anſwer him againe, as *Hierome* did the Pelagian heretike: [a] *Thou ſaieſt, the commandements of God are eaſie, but yet thou bringeſt foorth no man that hath fulfilled them all. Tell me,* ſaith he, *are they eaſie, or are they hard to be done? If*

a Hier. ad Ctesiphont. Facilia dicis Dei esse mandata, & tamen nullum proferre potes qui universa compleverit. Responde mihi, facilia sunt, an difficilia? si facilia, profer quis impleverit, & cur Dominus in Euangelio, Intrate, inquit, per angustam portam? sin autem difficilis, cur ausus es dicere, facilia esse Dei mandata quæ nullus impleverit?

they

*they be easie, shew vs who hath fulfilled them, and why our Saviour saith in the Gospell, Enter in at the straite gate? But if they bee hard, why doest thou dare to say that the commandements of God are easie which no man hath fulfilled?* Thus *Hierome* plainely excepteth against his answer to those words of Christ; for they to whom Christ speaketh those words, were and are men endued with the grace of God, and yet hee giueth them to vnderstand, that the gate of life shall bee straite and narrow vnto them. Therefore *S. Austine* saith, that [b] *the way of vertue is hard, and though the grace of God do help, yet is not to be traueled without labour and paines.* Now if it be so hard a matter, and so full of trauaile and paines, to compasse that [c] *small and vnperfect righteousnesse* which here wee haue, is it an easie matter with *M. Bishop*, to atchieue that absolute and perfect righteousnesse that is described in the law? Some help he thinketh to haue in that the Apostle saith; [d] *I am able to do all things in Christ, or by the helpe of Christ that strengtheneth mee.* But the Apostle himselfe excludeth him from that helpe, in that he so plainly testified of himselfe, that he could not find how to performe the good that he would, as we haue seen before, yea & telleth vs, that though *the Spirit* be in vs *lusting against the flesh*, yet by reason of the [e] *flesh lusting against the spirit, we cānot do the things that we would.* He that could do all things, yet could not repell the [f] *buffeting Angell of Satan*, by whom he was greeuously afflicted, nor was thought able to withstand the temptations of pride and vaine glory, vpon *the abundance of his reuelations*, as appeareth in that this sting of Satan was occasioned to bridle him therefrom. The place it selfe plainly sheweth the meaning of it selfe, that he was enabled to all things, that is, to the enduring of all things that concerned him in the seruice that he had in hand, that neither abōding nor wanting neither fulnes nor hūger should hinder him frō going on therein for the preaching & testifying of the Gospell, & for enlarging and cōfirming of the Church of Christ, accordingly as elsewhere hee saith, [g] *I suffer all things for the elects sake.* But the restraint that *Bernard* vseth is not to be omitted. [h] *He is able to do all things, that is, all which it is behoouefull that he be able to do.* Now what is behoouefull, it is not for *M. Bishop* to presume, but for God himselfe to determine, who hath not thought fitte to bring vs to perfection in this life, that he may haue the whole glorie of our saluation in the life to come. The wordes of *Dauid*

b *Aug. de predest. & grat. ca. 9. Arduum est virtutis iter, & quamquam adiumento gratiæ Dei non sine labore gradiendum.*

c *Idem. cont. 2 ep. Pelag. lib 3. p. 7. Ista parua iustitia. Et epist 200. Iustitia nondum consummata.*

d Phil. 4. 13.

e Gal. 5. 17.

f 2. Cor. 12. 7.

g 2. Tim. 2 10.

h *Bern. de dilig. Deo. In ille omnia potest quæ tamen posse presti.*

are

i Pſal.119. are as little helpfull vnto him, [i] *I will runne the way of thy commandements, when thou haſt ſet my heart at libertie.* So farre as we are at libertie, ſo farre we runne, and ſo faſt we runne. But we attaine not
k Rom.7.23. to that libertie yet, but that beeing [k] *holden captiue to the law of ſinne*
l 24. *which is in our members*, we haue ſtill cauſe to crie, [l] *Who ſhall deliuer*
m 2.Cor.3.17 *vs (or ſet vs at libertie) from this body of death?* [m] *Where the ſpirit of*
n Rom.8.23. *the Lord is, there is libertie.* We haue receiued as yet only [n] *the firſt fruites of the ſpirit.* We haue yet therefore but the firſt fruites of li-
o Heb.12 1. berty, and there is ſtill remaining ſomewhat [o] *that preſſeth downe, and ſinne hanging faſt on*, ſo that wee cannot runne without much
p Matt.26.41. hinderance and many falls, and the [p] *willingneſſe of the ſpirit* findeth alwaies a let by *the infirmitie and weakneſſe of the fleſh.*

## 43 W. Bishop.

*Hauing now confuted all that is commonly propoſed to proue the impoſſibilitie of keeping Gods commandements, let vs now ſee what we can ſay in proofe of the poſſibility of it: Firſt,* S Paul *is very plainely for it, ſaying:* That which was impoſſible to the law, in that is weakened
Rom.8. by the fleſh, God ſending his Sonne in the ſimilitude of fleſh, of ſinne, damned ſinne in the fleſh, that the iuſtification of the law might be fulfilled in vs, who walke not according to the fleſh, but according vnto the ſpirit. *See how formally he teacheth, that Chriſt dying to redeeme vs from ſinne, purchaſed vs grace to fulfill the lawe, which before was impoſſible vnto our weake fleſh. Againe, how farre S.*
Cap 5. Iohn *was from that opinion, of thinking Gods commandements to bee impoſſible, may appeare by that Epiſtle:* And his commandements
Mat.11. be not heauie. *Which is taken out of our Sauiours owne wordes:* My yoke is ſweete, and my burthen is light. *The reaſon of this is, that although to our corrupt frailty they be very heauie: yet when the vertue of charitie is powred into our hearts by the holy Ghoſt, then lo, do we with delight fulfill them. For as the Apoſtle witneſſeth:* Charity is the
Rom.13. fulneſſe of the law. *And,* Hee that doth loue his neighbour, hath
Mat.22. fulfilled the law: *Which Chriſt himſelfe teacheth, when he affirmeth,* That the whole lawe and prophets depend vpon theſe two commandements, of louing God, and our neighbour. *Now both according vnto our opinion and the Proteſtants, a man regenerate and in the ſtate of grace, hath in him the vertue of Charity: wee hold it to bee*

the

*the principall part of inherent iuſtice: they ſay that their iuſtifying faith can neuer be ſeparated from it: ſo that a righteous man being alſo indued with charity, is able thereby to fulfill the whole law. Let vs adioyne vnto theſe Authorities of holy write, the teſtimonie of one auncient Father or two.* S. Baſil *affirmeth:* That it is impious and vngodly, to ſay that the commandements of the ſpirit be vnpoſſible. *Serm in illud, Attende tibi.*

*S. Auſtine* defineth, that we muſt beleeue firmely, that God being iuſt and good, couldnot command things that be impoſſible for vs to fulfill: *The reaſon may be, that it is the part of a tirant, and no true lawmaker, to commaund his ſubiects to do that vnder paine of death which he knowes them no way able to performe: for thoſe were not to be called lawes, (which are to direct men to that which is iuſt) but ſnares to catch the moſt diligent in, and to bind them vp to moſt aſſured perdition. Wherefore it was afterward decreed in an approued Councell of Aranſican, as an article of faith, in theſe words:* This alſo we beleeue according to the Catholike faith, that all men baptized by grace there receiued, with the helpe and cooperation of Chriſt, can, and ought to keepe and fulfill thoſe things which belong to ſaluation. *The principall whereof are after our Sauiours owne determination, to keepe the commandements:* If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the commaundements. *De nat & gra. cap. 96.* *2 Can. vlt.* Matha 19.

*This by the way concerning the poſſibility of fulfilling the law.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Biſhop* hath a good opinion of that that he hath done, and if his fellowes do not accept it accordingly, no doubt but he will thinke they do him great wrong. As for vs we may by his leaue thinke that that we ſee, that he hath babled much, and ſaid as good as nothing, and that he is far from beeing a man to take vpon him the confuting of any thing that is defended on our part. But now leauing his confutation, he goeth in hand with proofe of a poſſibility in vs to fulfill the law. And firſt he alledgeth to that purpoſe the words of *S. Paul* in ſome part handled before, *That that was vnpoſſible to the law, in as much as it was weake becauſe of the fleſh, God ſending his owne Sonne in the ſimilitude of ſinfull fleſh, and for ſinne condemned ſinne in the fleſh, that the iuſtification or righteouſneſſe of the law might be fulfilled in vs, who walke not after the fleſh but after the ſpirit.* a Rom. 8. 3.

*ſpirit*. Now of this place he ſaith, that *it formally teacheth that Chriſt dying to redeeme vs from ſinne, did purchaſe vs grace to fulfill the law which before was impoſſible to our weake fleſh*. But he is ſtill ſo full of *formality*, that we can finde little matter in any thing that he ſaith. How hath Chriſt purchaſed grace for vs to fulfill the law in that ſenſe as here we ſpeake of fulfilling the law, when as the grace of Chriſt doth ſtill leaue remaining in vs a weakneſſe of fleſh, to which the Apoſtle ſaith, it is a thing vnpoſſible to fulfil the law? All *M. Biſhops* teeth cannot vntie this knot. If weakneſſe of fleſh hinder the fulfilling the law, then ſo long as we liue here the grace of Chriſt neuer putteth vs inſtate to fulfill the law, becauſe it neuer taketh from vs the weakneſſe of the fleſh. His commentarie therefore is nothing woorth, and becauſe it is but his owne, we make very ſmall account or reckoning of it. The cauſe of our not fulfilling the law continueth ſtill, and therefore we muſt referre the benefit here expreſſed to ſome other thing, then our fulfilling of the law. That the Apoſtle noteth firſt in ſaying, that *Chriſt condemned ſinne*, comparing it thereby to a priſoner, a robber or murtherer brought to the barre, and there receiuing ſentence of condemnation and death, that thenceforth it ſhould be bereaued of all action or accuſation, of all plea or power againſt vs. This Chriſt hath done for vs by purchaſing for vs the forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, whereby [b] *the Lord imputeth righteouſneſſe without workes*, becauſe as *S. Auſtine* ſaith, [c] *All the commandements of God are reputed to be done, when that that is not done is pardoned*. Now when all the commaundements of God are reputed to be done, *the iuſtification of the law is fulfilled in vs*. For what is *the iuſtification of the law*, but the iuſtification which the law might ſeeme to intend and propound vnto it ſelfe, that we might be acquitted of ſinne, and accepted vnto life? Thus the auncient Fathers expound it for [d] *the ſcope, the end, the thing deſtinated by the law*, which when the law could not attaine vnto, Chriſt performed it vnto vs by the forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes. [e] *He paid our debt*, ſaith Theodoret, *and performed that which was the ſcope of the law*. [f] *What was the end of the law*, ſaith Oecumenius? *That we ſhould not be ſubiect to the curſe. By Chriſt then that which was the ſcope of the law, was brought to effect in vs*. So Chryſoſtome, [g] *That which was the iuſtification of the law, not to be ſubiect to the curſe, Chriſt hath effected vnto vs*. Laſt of all *Ambroſe* ſaith,

[b] How

b Rom. 4. 6.
c *Aug. Retract. lib. 1. ca. 19. Omnia Dei mandata facta deputãtur quando quicquid non fit ignoſcitur.*
d *Theophylact. in Rom. ca. 8. Iuſtificatio legis, id eſt, exitus ipſe & deſtinatio.*
e *Theodoret. ibid. Noſtrum debitum exoluit & legis ſcopum perfecit.*
f *Oecumen. ibid. Quis eſt finis legis? Vt non eſſemus maledictioni obnoxii. Per Chriſtum quidem in effectum deductus eſt in nobis legis ſcopus.*
g *Chryſoſt. ibid. hom. 13. Quæ legis erat iuſtificatio non eſſe execrationi obnoxium, id tibi perfecit Chriſtus.*

[h] *How is the iuſtification of the law fulfilled in vs, but when there is giuen vnto vs forgiueneſſe of all our ſinnes?* The Apoſtle therefore by the *iuſtification of the law*, vnderſtandeth not inherent righteouſneſſe, but ſignifieth that that iuſtification which the law intended, but through our default could not make good vnto vs by inherent righteouſnes, Chriſt hath performed, in purchaſing for vs forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, by which wee are reputed iuſt and blameleſſe in Gods ſight, and accepted to be inheritours of euerlaſting life. Now *S. Ambroſe* to the former words addeth, [i] *That a man being iuſtified by the taking away of his ſinnes, may appeare in his mind ſeruing the law of God*, whereby hee noteth that to iuſtification by forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, is adioined regeneration to inherent righteouſneſſe, which he calleth afterwards [k] *a ſigne of iuſtificatiō* And this we denie not, but do alwaies moſt religiouſly teach the ſame; onely wee denie that this is that, wherein conſiſteth our iuſtification before God, but it is a ſequell and ſigne thereof, and wee neuer attaine to the perfection of it whileſt we liue here. And if wee will either directly or vndirectly vnderſtand it in theſe words, wee muſt take thereof that which *S. Auſtin* ſaith, that [l] *God ſo worketh in his Saints, labouring in the temptatiō of this life, as that there is yet for him largely to adde vnto them asking or crauing of him, and mercifully to pardon them when they confeſſe it vnto him*; yea, ſo as the ſame *S. Auſtin* elſewhere ſaith, [m] *as that our righteouſnes in this life rather conſiſteth in forgiueneneſſe of ſinnes, then in perfection of vertues.* Now therefore though the place be vnderſtood of inherent righteouſneſſe, yet it maketh not for *M. Biſhops* turne, becauſe it prooueth onely, that Chriſt ſhall reſtore vs to the perfect righteouſnes of the law, which we affirme, that hee beginneth in this life, and ſhall fully accompliſh in the life to come; but it proueth not that which he deſireth, that in this life wee are enabled by the grace of Chriſt, to the perfect fulfilling of the righteouſneſſe of the law. To the other places that he alledgeth, that *the commaundements of God are not heauie*; that *the yoke of Chriſt is eaſie, and his burden light*, he himſelfe in effect ſetteth downe the anſwer. *To our corrupt frailety*, ſaith he, *they be very heauy*. True; and therfore ſolong and ſo farre as this corrupt frailty continueth, ſo long and ſo farre the commaundements of God are ſtill heauy vnto vs, which muſt needs be till that which [n] *ſhall be ſowed in corruption and weakeneſſe, ſhall bee raiſed againe in incor-*

h *Ambroſ. ibid. Quomodo impietatur in nobis iuſtificatio niſi cum detur remiſſio omnium peccatorum?*

i *Ibid. Vt ſublatis peccatis iuſtificatus appareat mente ſeruiens legi Dei.*

k *Ibid. Signū iuſtificationis hoc eſt in homine, vt per id quod inhabitat in eo, iuſtificatus appareat eſſe filius Dei.*

l *Aug. de ſpir. & lit. ca. 36. Sic operatur iuſtificationem in ſanctis ſuis in huius vitæ tentatione laborantibus vt tamē ſic & quod petentibus largiter adijciat & quod confitentibus clementer ignoſcat.*

m *Idem de ciu. Dei. li. 19. cap. 27: Ipſa iuſtitia noſtra tanta eſt in hac vita vt potiùs remiſſione peccatorum conſtet quā perfectione virtutum.*

n *1. Cor. 15. 42. 43.*

*incorruption and power. When the vertue of charity*, saith he, *is powred into our soules, then we do with delight fulfill them.* True, so farre foorth as charity is powred into our soules. But so long as there is carnall concupiscence, there cannot be perfect charity to take full delight in the law of God, because[o] *carnal cõcupiscence euen by very being in vs*, as S. Austine saith, *doth abridge or diminish that spirituall delight of holy minds, of which the Apostle saith, I delight in the law of God, as touching the inner man.*[p] *Then shall bee perfect righteousnesse*, saith he againe, that is, perfect keeping of the commandements of God, *when there shall be perfect health; then perfect health, when perfect charity: then perfect charity, when we shall see him as he is.* In the meane time loue keepeth the commandements of God, but yet vnperfectly, because it selfe is but vnperfect, euen as a lame man goeth, but yet halteth in his going. To bee short, the same. *S. Austine* well obserueth, that[q] *God could not haue said that his commandements are not heauy, but that there may be an affection of heart to which they are not heauy.* Therefore[r] *when a man shall bee conuerted vnto God with all his heart, and with all his soule, he shall finde the commaundement of God not heauy vnto him.* But that affection, that conuersion is yet but begun. So long as concupiscence possesseth any part of the soule, all the soule is not yet conuerted vnto God. Very vainely therfore doth *M. Bishop* deale, when from that which we haue yet but in part for the fulfilling of the law, he inferreth the ful filling of the *whole law.* But to make vp the mater, he bringeth some authorities of the auncient Church, as much to his purpose, as that that he hath said already. That that *Basil* saith,[s] *that it is impious to say, that the commaundements of the spirit cannot be obserued* (for so the words are) is spoken of those things, which by no meanes can be done. As where the spirit saith, *Looke to thy selfe*, if a man will expound it of bodily looking and viewing of himself, it is that that cannot be done. For the *eie*, as he saith, *cannot see it selfe, it cannot see the head, nor the back, nor the face, nor into the bowels.* Now it were wickednesse, as he saith, to say that the spirit commaundeth any thing in this sort. But we say not so of the commaundements of God; for we teach that by the grace of Christ we fulfill them in part already, and shal do it perfectly when the impediment which is the remainder of originall corruption shall bee done away. But so long as the[t] *flesh lusteth against the spirit, so that we cannot do the things*

[o] Aug. cont. Iul. lib. 4 cap. 2. In quitum inest nocet ad minuendam spiri ualem delectationem sanctarũ mentium, illã scilicet de qua dicit Apostolus: Condelector legi Dei, &c.

[p] Idem de perfect. iustit. Hom. 8. Tũc erit plena iustitia quando plena sanitas: tunc plena sanitas quando plena charitas; tunc plena charitas quando videbimus sicuti est.

[q] Idem de nat. & grat. cap. 69. Deus iubere non potuisse diuinitus dicis, gratia non sunt nisi quia possit esse cordis affectus cui gratia non sunt.

[r] Ibid. Conuersus quisque ad Dominũ Deũ suum ex toto corde suo et ex tota anima sua mandatum Dei non habebit graue

[s] Basilius illud, Attende tibi. Impium est dicere spiritum præcepta seruari no posse.

[t] Gal. 5. 17.

things that we would, so long it is vnpossible for vs to obserue the righteousnesse of the law, according to the full measure and perfection thereof. Hereby the answere is plaine to the place that hee alledgeth out of *Austine*. For we beleeue that God hath not commaunded any thing vnpossible, meaning as he doth, absolutely and wholy vnpossible. We say as he saith, [u] *There is no example of perfect righteousnes amongst men, and yet it is not vnpossible. For it might be performed if there were so great will put to it as is sufficient for so great a matter. And there should be so great will, if on the one side nothing were hidden from vs of those things which belong to righteousnesse, and on the other side the same did so delight the mind, as that that delight did ouercome al other impediments of pleasure or paine. Which that it is not so, is not to be referred to any impossibility of the thing but to the iudgement of God.* [x] *For God*, as he saith afterwards, *wanteth not power so to assist the will of man, as that euen now righteousnesse may in euery sort be made perfect in him. And if it were the will of God that euen now this corruptible in any man should put on incorruption, & hee would appoint that he should liue heere immortal amongst mortal men, so as that all oldnesse being vtterly consumed, there should be no longer any law in the members to rebel against the law of the mind, & that he should so know God as the Saints heereafter shall know him, who would be so mad as to affirme that God cannot do it? But why hee doth it not, some what there is in the secrecie & depth of his iudgement, that euery mouth euen of the iust may be stopped in their owne praise, and not bee opened but to the praise of God.* Thus therefore the commaundements of God are not vnpossible to bee done, because God can make vs able perfectly to fulfill the same. Yea, it is in his power euen in this life to bring vs to this perfection, if it were his will and pleasure so to doe. But in his wisedome he hath thought good to giue vs in this life only some tast and beginnings thereof, whereby we very well see and vnderstand, that there is no impossibility in the rest. The reason why he doth so is, because hee will haue vs, yea euen the most iust and righteous of vs, full to vnderstand by our defects, that our saluation is not of our merits or works, but onely of his mercy. But in his due time hee will giue vs fully

u *Aug de spir. & lit. cap. 35. Sine exemplo est in hominibus perfecta iustitia & tamen impossibile non est. Fieret enim, si tanta voluntas adhiberetur quanta sufficit tantæ rei. Esse autem tanta si & nihil eorum quæ pertinent ad iustitiam nos teneret, & ea sic delectarent animum, vt quicquid aliud siue voluptas siue dolor impedit delectatio illa superaret. Quod vt nō sit non ad impossibilitatem, sed ad iudicium Dei pertinet.*

x *Ibid. cap. 36. Nullo modo dicendum est Deo deesse possibilitatem qua voluntas sic adiuuetur humana vt iustitia omni ex parte modo perficiatur in homine. Quandoquidem si nunc velit in quo jam etiam hoc corruptibile induere incorruptione, atq; hic in ter homines mortis-*

*tos eum inbere viuere minimè moriturum, vt tota penitus vetustate consumpta nulla lex in membris eius repugnet legi mentis, deumq; vbiq; præsentem ita cognoscat, sicuts eum sanctis postea cogniturus sunt, quis dement audeat affirmare non posse? Sed quare non faciat, & est aliquid in abdito & profundo iudiciorum Dei, vt etiam iustorum omne os obstruatur in laude sua, & non aperiatur nisi in laudem Dei.*

to

to be ſatisfied with that righteouſneſſe, with the taſt onely where-of he now prouoketh rather then aſſwageth our hunger and thirſt. Euen y *the great commaundement of righteouſneſſe to loue the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our ſoule, with all our minde, where-to is conſequent that other of louing our neighbour as our ſelfe, we ſhall fulfill in that life when we ſhall ſee face to face. But therfore euen now is that commanded vnto vs, that we ſhould thereby be aduertiſed what to aske and pray for in faith, to what to ſend our hope before vs, & to what to follow hard forward, forgetting that that is behind.* Now therefore as it is moſt eaſie for a man that hath ſound and perfect eies to diſcerne the light, which yet is impoſſible for him that is blinde, ſo long as he continueth ſo; ſo when God ſhall perfectly reſtore vs to our ſpirituall health and ſtrength, it ſhall bee eaſie and delightfull vnto vs, to keepe all the righteouſnes which God hath commanded, but ſo long as we continue in this weakeneſſe and frailty, we can by no meanes bee ſaid to attaine to the perfection of the law. But heere *M. Biſhop* vnſtringeth his tongue againſt God, and ſaith that *it is the part of a tyrant, not of a true lawmaker to commaund his ſubiects to doe that vpon paine of death, which hee knowes them no way able to performe.* A ſilly fooliſh man, that by his brainefick fancies meaſureth the wiſedome and righteouſneſſe of God, and taketh vpon him preſumptuouſly, to giue law vnto God in what ſort hee ſhall make lawes for men. But God is able in this behalfe to acquit himſelfe, *that he may be iuſtified in his ſayings, and found clear when he is iudged.* For the iuſt God was not in making of lawes, to regard mans ableneſſe but his owne righteouſneſſe, and therefore to forbid all ſinne, that hee might not ſeeme to approue any, and to command all righteouſneſſe, that hee might not ſeeme to neglect any. It ſhould not haue beene known to be ſinne which he had not regarded to forbid, nor taken for righteouſneſſe which hee had not vouchſafed to commaund. Was it fit that the rule of righteouſneſſe ſhould haue bene abridged in fauour of mans ſinne, when the want of power to fulfill the law, was not by Gods default in creating man, but by mans diſabling himſelf in turning away from God? But *M. Biſhops* folly and ignorance appeareth heerein very plainly, for that the ſcripture teacheth vs that the vſe of *the law*, we not being able to fulfill it, was to be [a] *our ſchoolemaſter to traine vs vnto Chriſt.* God had not any opinion in giuing the law of our perfor-

y *Ibid. Primum præceptũ inſtituit ie quo iubemur diligere Deum ex toto corde &c. in illa vita complebimus cùm videbimus facie ad faciem. Sed ideo nobis hoc etiam nunc præceptum eſt vt admoneremur quid fide exposcere, quò ſpẽ premitt ere, et obliuiſcendo quæ retro ſunt, in quæ anteriora extendere debeamus.*

z Rom. 3. 4.

a Gal. 3. 24.

performance thereof, but hee intended it to be as a glaſſe for vs to ſee our ſelues, and to conceiue thereby our owne eſtate, that finding our ſelues to bee miſerable and vtterly loſt in our ſelues, wee might the more readily accept of the ſaluation that is freely offred vnto vs by Ieſus Chriſt. Thus ſaith the Apoſtle againe, b *Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſſe to euery one that beleeueth.* Therefore *S. Auſtine* ſaith, that c *the intent of the law reproouing vs is this, to make vs for our miſdoings to flie to the grace of the mercifull God, where what we doe amiſſe may be pardoned, and by the helpe of the ſame grace may not be done.* To ſome part whereof wee are come already by repentance and amendment of life, and mortification of fleſhly luſts, but yet not ſo, but that ſtill wee do many things amiſſe, and ſtand in neede of pardon. The law in the meane time ſerueth vs for a patterne of true righteouſneſſe, teaching vs what wee are to ſtriue vnto, what the purity is whereunto God hath called vs, that though in the priſon of corruptible fleſh, we cannot fully anſwer the ſame, yet we may ſtill be labouring towards it, ſighing & groaning at that infirmity and diſeaſe that hindreth vs from it, praying inſtantly vnto God to bring vs to it, that his grace and mercy may in the end make vs partakers of our deſire, and thenceforth wee may neuer do amiſſe. d *Why ſhould not this perfection bee commanded to man*, ſaith Auſtine, *although no man haue it in this life? For we cannot runne aright, if we know not to what to runne. And how ſhould wee know if by no commandements it were declared vnto vs?* Againe he ſaith: e *The Pelagians* (he might haue ſaid the Papiſts) *thinke they know ſome great matter when they ſay, God would not commaund that which he knew could not be done by man.* Let *M. Biſhop* take knowledge of his obiection vſed of old by the Pelagian heretickes. *S. Auſtine* anſwereth, f *Who knoweth not ſo much? But therefore doth hee commaund ſome things which we cannot do, that we may know what we are to aske of him. It is faith which by praier obtaineth that which the law commaundeth.* The commaundements of God then are not vnpoſſible; for if they were vnpoſſible, we could neuer hope to attaine to the keeping of them. But now we pray vnto God that he will, and according to his promiſe we beleeue that he will bring vs to that ſtate of innocency and perfection, wherein wee ſhall fully anſwer the image of perfect righteouſneſſe, which is ſet before vs in the law. In the meane time there is a let that hindereth vs, and

b Rom. 10. 4.

c *Aug. de nat. & grat. cap. 12. Hæc eſt intentio legis arguentis vt propter ea quæ peperàm fiunt confugiatur ad gratiam Domini miſerantis, &c. vbi et remittantur quæ malè fiunt & eadè gratia iuuante non fiant.*

d *Idem de perfect. iuſtit. Rat. 17. Cur non præciperetur homini iſta perfectio quamuis eam in hac vita nemo habeat? Nõ enim rectè currit ſi quo currendum eſt neſciatur. Quomodo autem ſciretur ſi nullis præceptis oſtenderetur?*

e *De grat. & lib. arbit. cap. 16. Magnum aliquid Pelagiani ſe ſcire putant quando dicunt, Non iuberet Deus quod ſciret ab homine non poſſe fieri.*

f *Quis hoc neſcit? ſed ideò iubet aliqua quæ non poſſumus vt ſciamus quid ab illo petere debeamus. Ipſa eſt fides quæ orando impetrat quod lex imperat.*

holdeth vs backe, that it is not possible for vs so long as it continueth, to do those things which yet are possible to bee done. The Arausican Councell saith nothing of fulfilling the law, but speaketh generally of doing those things which *belong to saluatiō*. Now to our saluation it belongeth to know and confesse, that [g] *by the workes of the law no flesh shall bee iustified in the sight of God.* To our saluation belongeth an humble acknowledgement of our vnablenesse to satisfie the law, true repentance of our sinnes, the faith of Iesus Christ, that by him and in him wee may haue supply of that wherein we were found defectiue by the law. In a word, it is the way to exclude vs from saluation, to place our affiance and trust of obtaining the same in our fulfilling of the law, the Apostle telling vs, that [h] *so many as are of the works of the law, are vnder the curse, because it is written, Cursed is euery one that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the law to do them,* whereas [i] *there is not a man iust vpon earth that doth good, and sinneth not.* The words of Christ, [k] *If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the commandements,* were spoken to the young man, to the same end to which the law generally was giuen, to giue him occasion to measure and know himselfe by the commandements, that so he might seeke the way of saluation in Christ, which in the law being a transgresse further of he could not finde. But of these words enough hath beene said before in the question of [l] *the certainty of Saluation.* For conclusion of this point, to quit *M. Bishop*, I will alledge the words of S. *Bernard*,[m] *It was not vnknowne to the commaunder, that the waight of the commandement doth exceede the strength of man; but hee held it expedient, that hereby men should bee aduertized of their owne vnsufficiencie, and that they should know to what end of righteousnes they should labour to their vttermost. Therefore by commaunding things vnpossible to vs, he hath not made vs trespassers, but humbled vs, that euery mouth may be stopped, and all the world may bee made subiect to God. For receiuing the commandement, and feeling our owne defect and want, we shall cry to heauen, and God will haue mercy vpon vs, and we shall know at that day, that not for the works of righteousnesse which we haue done, but of his own mercy he hath saued vs.* In which words he giueth vs to vnderstand, that God had reason sufficient to giue

g Rom. 3. 20.

h Gal. 3. 10.

i Eccles. 7. 22.

k Mat. 19. 17.

l Cha. 3. Sect. 3.

m Bernard in Cant. ser. 50. Noluit praeceptor tē praecepti pondus humanas excedere vires, sed iudicauit vtile ex hoc ipso sue ipsos insufficientiae admoneri, et vt iuuent sanè ad quem iustitiae finem viribus pro viribus oporteret. Ergo mandendo impossibilia nos praemunit ad re: fecit sed humiles, vt omne os obstruatur & subditus fiat to: tus mundus Deo. Accipientes quippe mandatum & sententes defectum c'amabimus in cœlum & miserebitur nostri Deus, & sciemus in die illa quia non ex operibus iustitiae quae fecimus nos sed secundum misericordiam suam saluos nos fecit.

the

the law, though he knew it vnpossible for vs in this state of mortality and weakenesse, perfectly to fulfill the law.

## 44. W. Bishop.

*That good works be not stained with sinne.*

*Now that iust mens workes be not sinnes: which I proove first, by some works of that pattern of patience,* Iob: *Of whom it is written, that notwithstanding all the diuels power and craft in tempting of him,* He continued still a single harted and an vpright man, departing from euil, and preseruing his innocency. *If he continued an innocent, hee sinned not: Againe, if in all these instigations to impatience, hee remained patient: these his workes were perfect. For* S. Iames *saith,* Esteeme it my brethren all ioy, when you shal fall into diuers temptations: knowing that the probation of your faith worketh patience: And let patience haue a perfect worke, that you may bee perfect and entire, failing in nothing. Cap. 2. Cap. 1.

2. *King* Dauid *thus by the inspiration of the holy Ghost speaketh of himselfe,* Thou hast (O Lord) prooued my heart, thou hast visited me in the night, thou hast tried me in fire, and there was no iniquity found in mee. *It must needs then bee granted that some of his workes at least were free from all sinne and inquity. And that the most of them were such, if you heare the holy Ghost testifying it, I hope you will beleeue it: reade then where it is of record,* That *Dauid* did that which was right in the sight of our Lord (*and not onely in the sight of men*) and turned from nothing that hee commaunded him all the dayes of his life, except onely the matter of *Vrias* the Hethite. Psal. 16. 3. Reg. 15.

3. *The Apostle affirmeth,* That some men doe build vpon the onely foundation Christ Iesus, gold, siluer, and pretious stones: *that is, being choise members of Christs Catholike Church, doe many perfect good workes, such as beeing tried in the furnace of Gods iudgement, will suffer no losse or detriment, as hee there saith expresly: Wherefore they must needs bee pure, and free from all drosse of sinne, otherwise hauing bene so prooued in fire, it would haue beene found out.* 1. Cor. 3.

4. *Many workes of righteous men please God:* Make your bodies a quick sacrifice, holy & acceptable to God: the same offring spiritu- Rom. 12. 1. Pet. 2.

Phil. 4. all sacrifices acceptable to God. *And* S. Paul calleth almes bestowed on him in prison, an acceptable sacrifice of sweet sauour, and pleasing God. *But nothing infected with sinne (all which hee hateth deadly) can please God, and be acceptable in his sight: God of his mercy through Christ doth pardon sin, or as the Protestants speake, not impute it to the person: but to say that a sinfull worke is of sweet sauour before him, and a gratefull sacrifice to him, were blasphemy: wherefore wee must needs confesse, that such works which so well pleased him, were not defiled with any kind of sinne.*

Mat. 5. 1. Tim. 6. Ephes. 2. *Finally, many workes in holy writ be called good, as,* That they may see your good workes: To be rich in good works: We are created in Christ Iesus to good works: *but they could not truly be called good workes if they were infected with sinne. For according to the iudgment of all learned Diuines, it can be no good worke, that faileth either in substance, or circumstance, that hath any one faule in it: for* bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quolibet defectu. *Wherefore wee must either say, that the holy Ghost calleth euill good, which were blasphemy, or else acknowledge, that there be many good workes free from all infection of sinne.*

R ABBOT.

The wise man hauing prefixed this title, *That good works bee not stained with sinne,* which we say they be, taketh vpon him in his text to proue, *that iust mens works be no sinnes,* which no man saith they be. We must beare with him, because his vnderstanding doth not serue him to take that for gold, wherein there is any drosse: for if it did, he would easily conceiue that the staine of mans sinne doth not destroy or take away the nature of the good worke which in man & by man is wrought by the grace of God. But leauing that peece of his folly, let vs examine his proofes, that good works bee stained with sinne. And first he will proue it by the example of *Iob,* because

a Iob. 1. 3. it is said of him, that a *he continued still a single hearted and an vpright man, departing from euill, and preserving his innocencie.* But it were very hard to say, how *M. Bishops* purpose should be made good out of these words. We find here a relation of *Iobs* goodnesse, but we find nothing to proue, that that goodnesse of his was no way touched or stained with sin. Now the reader is to vnderstand, that this cómendation of *Iob* set down in the 1. Chapter, & after repeated in the 2. chapter to shew his constancy therin, was of old vrged by the

Pelagian

Pelagian heretikes, as now by *M. Bishop* to proue the perfection of the righteousnesse of man. But *S. Austine* well weighing the circumstance of the text, how it is withall said, *There is none like him in the earth*; and considering what *Iob* elsewhere saith; [b] *How should a man be iust before God?* answereth him in this sort; [c] *According to a measure of humane conuersation, God giueth him this so great testimonie of righteousnesse, but he himselfe being afrad of himselfe, according to that rule of righteousnesse, which as he can he seeth with God, knoweth in truth that so it is, that there shal not a man be found iust before God.* Thus he saith againe, that [d] *he was commended in comparison of men liuing vpon earth.* Hereby then it appeared that there is nothing in these words of *Iobs* commendation, that auaileth *M. Bishop* any whit at all. Which that it may the better appeare, *Iob* saith of himself as the vulgar Latine translateth, [e] *I was afraid of all my workes.* Whereof what we are to conceiue, we may esteeme by that that *Gregory* Bishop of Rome speaketh by occasion of other words of the same *Iob*, that [f] *the holy man because he saw all the merit of our vertue to be faulty, if it be strictly iudged by him that iudgeth within, saith rightly, If I will contend with him, I shall not be able to answer him one for a thousand.* To which purpose he saith afterwards againe, that [g] *man is not able to answer to God, questioning or reasoning with him, because if he be sifted without fauour, the life euen of the iust quaileth in that examination.* This made *Iob* afterward to say of himselfe againe: [h] *Behold, I am vile, what shall I answer thee? I will lay my hand vpon my mouth.* Whereupon *Hierome* saith against the Pelagians: [i] *Behold our* Iob *so innocent and without reproofe, with what end of righteousnesse he is crowned, that he standeth in need of mercy at Gods hands.* By all which it may appeare, how impertinently *M. Bishop* alledgeth the words of *Iames*, to affirme the perfection of *Iobs* works. Yea, what a mad connexion doth he make? *S. Iames* saith, [k] *Let patience haue a perfect worke that you may be perfect and entire, failing in nothing.* Therefore if *Iob* remained patient, then his workes were perfect. He should vnderstand that a man may remaine patient, and yet his patience not altogether perfect, being resisted and interrupted by the weakenesse and rebellion of the flesh; euen as came to passe in holy *Iob*, as may appeare by many of his owne speeches, and by the reproofe that God vsed to him in the end; [l] *Is this to learne, to striue with the almighty?*

b Cap 9.2.

c *Aug. de pec. cat. merit. & remiss. lib. 2. ca. 10. Secundùm modũ cõuersationis humanæ perhibet ei Deus tam magnũ iustitiæ testimonium, ipse autẽ se metuens ex regula illa iustitiæ quam sicut potest conspicit apud deum, sin veritate scit quia ita est quia non erit homo iustus ante deum.*

d *Ibid. ca. 12. Ex hominum qui in terra sunt cõparatione laudatur.*

e *Iob 9 28. Verebar omnia opera mea.*

f *Grego. Moral. lib. 9. ca. 1. Sanctus vir quia omne virtutis nostræ meritum vitiũ esse cõspexit si ab interno arbitro districtè iudicetur, rectè subiungit, si voluero &c.*

g *Ibid. cap. 8 Interrogationi illius homo respondere non sufficit, quia si remota tunc pietate discutitur in illo examine etiã iustorum vita succumbit.*

h Iob. 39. 37.

i *Hieron. cont. Pelag. lib. 2 Ecce Iob noster immaculatus & sine querela quali iustitiæ fine corona[tur] vt misericordia Dei indigeat.*

k Jam. 1. 4.

l Job. 39. 35.

*mighty? he that reproueth God, let him anſwer to it.* Therefore the remaining of patience doth not proue it ſelfe to be perfect; much leſſe prooued it the perfection of other workes. *The perfect worke of patience* intended by ſaint *Iames* is *perſeuerance*, whereby we continue and grow forward to that perfection which our Sauiour Chriſt ſetteth as a marke for vs to aime at, [m] *be ye perfect as your heauenly Father is perfect*: but yet ſtill finde cauſe ſo long as we liue here, to ſay with the Apoſtle, [n] *Not as though I were alreadie perfect.* If maſter *Biſhop* thinke that here we can be perfect and entire lacking nothing, let him remember what Saint *Hierome* ſaith; [o] *To haue all things and to want nothing is a matter of his vertue who did no ſinne, neither was guile found in his mouth.* Let him not therefore dreame of it, [p] *till we al meete together vnto a perfect man, and vnto the meaſure of the age of the fulneſſe of Chriſt.* But as touching perfection more hereafter.

m Mat. 5. 48.

n Phil. 3. 12.

o Hieron cont. Pelag. lib. 1. Omnia habere & nullo indigere virtutis eſt eius qui peccatum nõ fecit nec inuentus eſt in ore eius dolus.

p Ephe. 4. 13.

That which he alledgeth ſpoken by *Dauid* concerning himſelfe, is abſurdly forced to his purpoſe, whileſt he vrgeth it as ſimply & generally ſpoken, which was ſpoken onely in a ſpecial reſpect. [q] *There was no iniquitie found in him* as touching any imagination or practiſe againſt *Saul*, whereof he was vniuſtly and wrongfully accuſed; but otherwiſe ſimply ſpeaking of himſelfe, he ſaith, [r] *Mine iniquities are gone ouer my head, and as a weighty burden they are too heauie for me.* [ſ] *O Lord if thou be extreame to marke iniquities, who ſhall abide it?* [t] *Enter not into iudgment with thy ſeruant, O Lord, for in thy ſight no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified.* Hereby therefore it is plaine alſo that that which is ſaid of *Dauid*, that [u] *he turned from nothing that the Lord commanded him all the daies of his life, but onely the matter of* Vrias *the Hittite*, is to bee vnderſtood according to the occaſion whereof it is ſpoken, the text ſetting downe before the wickedneſſe of *Abijam* in his reigne and gouernement ouer the Kingdome of Iudah, ſinning himſelfe by publike idolatrie, and cauſing the people alſo to ſinne with him. To him his Father *Dauid* is oppoſed, as touching lawes and publike gouernement, and direction of his people, that he turned not aſide from the commaundements of the Lord, nor cauſed any publike ſcandall or offence, but onely in commanding the death of *Vrijah* the Hittite, for colouring the adulterie committed in priuate with his wife.

q Pſal. 17. 3.

r Pſal. 38. 4.

ſ 130. 3.

t 143. 2.

u 1 King. 15. 5.

As

As touching the third proofe that hee bringeth out of Saint *Pauls* wordes to the Corinthians, it is apparent by the place it ſelfe, that it is verie abſurdly wreſted. For Saint *Paul* ſpeaketh there of *building* by the preaching of the Goſpell, as is cleare by the wordes immediatlie going before ; [x] *According to the grace of God giuen vnto mee, as a skilfull Maſter builder I haue laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon; but let euery one take heede howe hee buildeth vpon it.* Then ſignifying the foundation whereupon the building is to ſtand to bee Ieſus Chriſt, hee proſecuteth that caueat, giuing to vnderſtand, that there ſhall be a triall of the worke of euerie builder, whereby loſſe ſhall growe to them who are not carefull to build ſuch matter as is proportionable to the foundation. Hee therefore that buildeth *gold, and ſiluer, and precious ſtones*, that is, true faith and doctrine according to Chriſt, his worke ſhall abide the triall of the word of truth, and his labour ſhall haue reward. But if any man build vpon Chriſt *timber, hay, and ſtubble*, that is, the traſh of humane traditions and ſuperſtitions, *the fire*, that is, [y] *the word of Doctrine*, as *Chryſoſtome* expoundeth it, ſhall conſume it ; by the word of the Goſpell that which hee hath builded ſhall bee reproued and reiected, and hee ſhall loſe both his labour and reward. This is the verie direct and plaine meaning of the Apoſtles wordes, fully agreeing with the circumſtance of the text. But Maſter *Biſhop* perforce and againſt the haire, draweth the text to be conſtrued of workes; and like to a ſorie husband, who for a penny preſent gaine neglecteth a ſhilling profitte another way, for the gaining of a preſent ſmall aduantage, is content to bereaue himſelfe of that that ſhould ſteede him much more in another cauſe. For whereas they are woont generally to alledge this place, and to expound *the fire* heere ſpoken of, for the maintenance of Purgatorie fire, hee for a ſhift heere turneth Purgatorie fire into the *furnace of Gods iudgement*, and ſo ſtriketh downe a maine pillar of the Popes Kitchin, and endangereth [z] *the craft whereby hee and his ſellowes haue their goods.* Surely if Purgatorie fire doe not burne here, it is hard to ſay how they will get it a chimney wherein to burne any otherwhere. But to the point, it hath beene alreadie ſhewed, that there is no gold or ſiluer of our workes, wherein there

x 1. Cor. 3. 10.

y *Chryſoſt de pœnitent hom. 8 Ig. ne examinemus; verbo ſcilicet doctrinæ.*

z Act. 17. 15.

is not found ſome droſſe if triall bee made thereof in the furnace of Gods iudgement; no ſtones ſo precious wherein the Ieweller of heauen doth not find ſpeckes and flawes, if he preciſely take view of them, ſo that [a] *woe to the commendable life of man*, ſaith S. *Auſtine*, *if God ſet mercie aſide in the iudging of it*, and therefore all pray that God will not enter into iudgement with them. The gold notwithſtanding & ſiluer, and pretious ſtones which we build in our good works, through Gods mercie ſhall abide and haue their glorie; the droſſe thereof the *fire* of repentance ſhal conſume, whileſt we aske and obtaine of him pardon and forgiueneſſe of all our imperfections and wants, of all that *timber, and hay, and ſtubble* of carnall and earthly affections, with the duſt whereof our feet haue been ſoiled, and beraied in walking the path of the faith of Chriſt. Yea he that [b] *baptizeth his with the holy Ghoſt and with fire*, will by this *fire* purge from vs and our works this droſſe and corruption more and more, till he bring vs out of the furnace as the pure and perfect gold to be glorious before him for euer & euer. To be ſhort, the fire of Gods iudgement mitigated and aſſwaged with the water and dew of his mercie, ſhall at that day giue approbation and teſtimonie of righteouſnes to the good works of his ſeruants, ſo as that becauſe they are true gold which that fire conſumeth not, they ſhal not for ſome droſſe receiue any loſſe or detriment therein, but fully receiue that reward in the hope and expectation whereof they haue laboured in the Lord. Therefore though we would vnderſtand theſe words of the works of holy men, as without forcing them we cannot, yet is there nothing whence *M. Biſhop* can inferre that which hee intendeth, that good works are wholly free from all droſſe and ſtaine of ſinne. As little hath he for his purpoſe in his next argument. *Many works of righteous men pleaſe God*, ſaith hee, *but nothing infected with ſinne can pleaſe God.* Nothing indeede if it be conſidered as infected with ſinne; and therefore good works being touched and infected with the contagion of ſinne, before they can pleaſe God, muſt haue ſome meanes to take away the guilt and imputation of the ſinne. There was [c] *iniquity in the holy offerings of the children of Iſrael, but the high Prieſt did beare the iniquity to make the offerings acceptable before the Lord.* There is iniquity in our holy offerings, our *ſpiritual ſacrifices*, but Chriſt our High Prieſt hath borne the iniquitie, and they are [d] *acceptable to GOD by Ieſus Chriſt.*

a *Aug. Confeſſ. lib. 9. cap. 13. Ve etiam laudabili vitæ hominum ſi remota miſericordia diſcutias eam.*

b Mat. 3. 11.

c Exod. 28. 38.

d 1. Pet. 2. 5.

Not

Not by themſelues, or by their own perfection, but by Ieſus Chriſt, beeing perfumed with the ſweete incenſe of his obedience, who [e] *for vs* (to make vs acceptable both in our ſelues and in our works) *hath giuen himſelfe an offering and a ſacrifice of a ſweete ſmelling ſauour vnto God.* Therefore by the pardoning and not imputing of ſinne, through the redemption of Chriſt, both the perſon and the worke are pleaſing in Gods ſight, neither is the ſame to bee called *a ſinnefull worke*, as *M. Biſhop* tearmeth it, becauſe it is in ſubſtance a good worke, and the fruit of the good ſpirit of God, and the default and imperfection is onely an accident to the worke. Briefly wee are to lay vp in our hearts that which the Prophet ſaith: [f] *As a father pitieth his children, ſo is the Lord mercifull vnto them that feare him: for he knoweth whereof wee be made, and remembreth that we are but duſt.* And therefore as a father accepteth the readineſſe and obedience of his child to that that he commandeth, though he doe the thing perhaps but rawly and rudely: ſo is God pleaſed through Chriſt with the good intendment & indeauour of his children, for the doing of that that hee requireth, though by the weakneſſe of the fleſh, much halting and lameneſſe, and imperfection appeare in that which they do.

e Ephe. 5. 2.

f Pſal. 103. 13.

By this appeareth the vanitie of his argument taken from the name of *good workes*, which he ſaith *could not be trulie called good, if they were infected with ſinne.* For as the offerings were truely called *holy offerings*, in which notwithſtanding there was ſome blot of iniquity: ſo are the workes of the faithfull truly called *good works*, in which notwithſtanding there is a ſtaine of the ſame iniquitie and ſinne. They are *good* in the ſubſtance of the deede, *good* in the originall of the grace and ſpirit of God from whence they proceede, *good* in the will & indeauour of the perſon by whom they are done, *good* in the acceptation of God, in whoſe name and ſeruice they are done: but yet they haue a blemiſh of euill [g] *by reaſon of the blot of bodily corruption growing faſt to*, as *Ambroſe* ſpeaketh, [h] *whereby being polluted and filthie* (ſaith *Hilary*) *we haue nothing in vs innocent, nothing cleane.* They are good then, but yet not perfectlie good, yea if God ſhould ſtrictly and narrowly deale with vs, hee ſhould haue iuſt cauſe of reiecting vs in the doing thereof, for that wee by our corruption do diſgrace that which proceedeth holy, and pure, and good from him. Now therefore whereas he ſaith, that it *can bee no*

g *Ambroſ. apud Auguſt. contra Iulian. lib. 2. Labes corporea concretionis.*

h *Hilar. ibid. Corpora noſtra vitiorum omnium materia. pro qua poluti & ſordidi nihil in nobis mundum, nihil innocens obtinemus.*

*good*

*good worke wherein is any defect*, he ſaith vntruly, becauſe good and euill haue their *latitude and degrees*: and accordingly as contraries expell each other, the one alwaies growing by the impairing of the other, accordingly as *S. Auſtine* ſaith: [i] *God doth not bring his good gifts into vs, except he take away our euils; and ſo far do the good things increaſe, as the euill are diminiſhed: neither ſhall the one bee perfected, till the other be fullie ended.* Now in this mixture of contraries, that giueth the name that preuaileth moſt: ſo that [k] *men are called iuſt*, as *Hierome* ſaith, *not for that they are without all vice, but in that they are commended for the greater part of vertues.* That therefore may rightly and truly bee called a good worke in ſome meaſure and degree of goodnes, which yet entirely, and perfectly, and wholly cannot be called good. But that wee may ſee how vainely and idlely hee talketh, his concluſion is diligently to bee obſerued, that *there may be many good works free from all infection of ſinne.* There be *many* ſuch, but all *good works* then it ſeemeth be not free from all infection of ſinne. And if all bee not ſo, then let him tell vs how thoſe good workes which be not free from all infection of ſinne, bee called *good workes*, as hee importeth, ſeeing no worke can bee called good, as he hath told vs before, *that faileth either in ſubſtance or in circumſtance, or hath any fault or defect in it.* Let him anſwer vs for thoſe ſome, and his anſwer ſhall ſerue vs for all the reſt.

i. *Aug. de verb. Dom ſer.* 11. *Non nobis infert bona ſua niſi auferat mala noſtra: & in tantum illa creſcunt, in quantum iſta minuuntur. nec illa perficientur niſi iſta finiantur.*

k *Hier. ad Creſiphont. Iuſti non quod omni vitio carent, ſed quod maiori virtutum parte commendentur.*

## 45. W. BISHOP.

*In lieu of the manifold teſtimonie of Antiquitie, which doth nothing more then recommend good workes, and paint out the excellencie of them, I will ſet downe one paſſage of* S. Auguſt. *wherein this very controuerſie is diſtinctly declared and determined: thus he beginneth:* The iuſtice (through which the iuſt man liueth by faith) becauſe it is giuen to man by the ſpirit of grace, is true iuſtice: the which, although it bee worthily called in ſome men perfect, according to the capacitie of this life, yet it is but ſmall in compariſon of that greater, which man made equall to Angels ſhall receiue. Which (heauenly iuſtice) he that had not as yet ſaid himſelfe to be perfect, in regard of that iuſtice that was in him: and alſo imperfect, if it be compared to that which he wanted. But certainly this leſſer iuſtice, or righteouſneſſe, breedeth and bringeth foorth merits, and that greater, is the reward thereof. Therefore hee that purſueth not this, ſhall not obtaine

Lib. 3. contra duas Epiſt. Pelag. cap. 7.

obtaine that. *Hitherto* S. Auſtine. *Note firſt, that he defineth the iuſtice which we haue in this life, to be true iuſtice, which is pure from al iniuſtice and iniquitie: then, that it is alſo perfect, nut failing in any duty which we be bound to performe. Laſtly, that it bringeth forth good works ſuch as merit life euerlaſting. True it is alſo, that this iuſtice although perfect in it ſelfe, ſo farre as mans capacitie in this life doth permit: yet being compared vnto the ſtate of iuſtice which is in heauen, it may be called imperfect, not that this is not ſufficient to defend vs frō all formall tranſgreſſion of Gods law: but becauſe it keepeth not vs ſometimes from veniall ſins, and hath not ſuch a high degree of perfection as* De ſpir. & lit. vit. c. 9. *that hath.* S. Auguſtin *hath the like diſcourſe, where he ſaith directly, that it appertaines to the leſſer iuſtice of this life, not to ſinne. So that we haue out of this oracle of Antiquity: that many works of a iuſt man are without ſinne.*

## R. Abbot.

Here *M. Biſhop* notably abuſeth *S. Auſtin*, and maketh him inſtead of all antiquitie, a witneſſe of that which he oppugneth euen in that very Chapter whence he citeth the words here ſet downe. Which that we may the better diſcerne, let vs examine particularly the collections that he maketh from the words. *Firſt, that the iuſtice that we haue in this life is true iuſtice.* We acknowledg the ſame euen as it is true gold wherein notwithſtanding there is found droſſe; euen as it is a true pearle, which notwithſtanding with handling hath a ſpot or ſtaine. It is true righteouſneſſe, [a] *but not pure,* ſaith *S. Bernard*: [b] *it will be found vnrighteouſneſſe and ſcant, if it be ſtrictly iudged.* Therfore *M. Biſhops* expoſition of *true iuſtice* is falſe, where he maketh the ſame to be *pure from all iniuſtice and iniquitie.* Secondly, he maketh *S. Auſtin* to ſay, that *our righteouſneſſe in this life is perfect, not failing in any duty which we are bound to performe.* But how lewdly doth he therin deale with *S. Auſtin*, who plainely teacheth, that [c] *our righteouſneſſe in this life ſtandeth rather in forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, then in perfection of vertues?* Yea in this chapter cited by him, he ſaith: [d] *The vertue which is now in the iuſt mā is thus farforth called perfect, as that to the perfectiō thereof belōgeth both the*

a Bernard. de verb. Eſa. Ser. 5. *Humilis iuſti iuſtitia ſed non pura.*

b Id. in ſeſt. ſanct. Ser. 1. *Si diſtrictè iudicetur iniuſta inuenietur omnis iuſtitia noſtra & minus habens.*

c Aug. de Ciu. Dei. lib. 19. ca. 27. *Magis remiſſione peccatorum conſtat, quam perfectione virtutum.*

d Idem contra 2. Epiſt. Pelag. li. 3. cap. 7. *Virtus quæ nunc eſt in homine iuſto hactenus perfecta nominatur, vt ad eius perfectionē pertineat, etiam ipſius imperfectionis, & in veritate cognitio, & in humilitate confeſſio. Tunc enim eſt ſecundum hanc infirmitatem perfecta iſta parua iuſtitia, quando etiam quid ſibi deſit intelligit. Ideoque Apoſtolus & imperfectū & perfectum ſe dicit; imperfectum, cogitando quantum illi adiuſtitiam deſit, cuius plenitudinem adhuc eſurit & ſitit. Perfectum autem quòd & ſuam imperfectionem confiteri non erubeſcit, & vt perueniat bene precedit.*

knowledge

*knowledge in truth, and in humilitie the confeſſion of the imperfection of it. For then is this ſmall righteouſneſſe for the modell (or little meaſure) of it perfect, according to this infirmitie, when it knoweth what there is wanting vnto it. Therefore the Apoſtle calleth himſelfe vnperfect and perfect, vnperfect, in bethinking how much he wanteth to righteouſnes, the fulneſſe whereof he yet hungreth and thirſteth after: perfect, both for that he is not aſhamed to confeſſe his imperfection, and for that he goeth well forward to come to perfection.* Now how ſhould we here acknowledge *imperfection*, if we be perfect according to the vttermoſt of that perfection that is required of vs here? How can we take vpon vs to know, that there is ſomwhat wanting to our righteouſneſſe, when we muſt beleeue it to be ſuch, as faileth not in any duty which we are bound to performe? How did the Apoſtle think that *he wanted much to righteouſneſſe*, when his righteouſneſſe wanted nothing that it ought to haue? How is it ſaid, that *he was not aſhamed to confeſſe his imperfection*, when yet there was no imperfection for him to confeſſe? Nay, how is it that *M. Biſhop* is not aſhamed to ſeeke by *Auſtin* to auouch ſuch a Paradoxe, ſo contrarie to ſenſe, ſo contrarie to conſcience, ſo contrarie to the confeſſions of al the faithful crying with one voice, [e] *Forgiue vs our treſpaſſes*, and that *for this very cauſe*, as *S. Auſtin* ſaith, *becauſe no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified in the ſight of God.* The ſame *S. Auſtin* telleth vs, that [f] *there is no example of perfect righteouſneſſe amongſt men*: that [g] *this is the perfection of man, to find himſelfe not to be perfect*: [h] that *he hath much profited in righteouſneſſe, who by profiting knoweth how farre he is from perfection of righteouſneſſe*: that *S. Paul was* [i] *perfect as a trauailer* (to perfect righteouſneſſe,) *not as one that was come vnto it*, becauſe [k] *they that go well forward, or profit well, are called perfect trauellers.* Theſe ſpeeches are euident and plaine, and will *M. Biſhop* tell vs, that *S. Auſtin* affirmeth, in this life *a perfect righteouſneſſe, not failing in any dutie which we are bound to performe?* To the ſame purpoſe *S. Hierome* alſo ſaith: that [l] *it is mans true wiſdome to know himſelfe to be vnperfect, and that there is but an vnperfect perfection of all that are righteous in this life.* And againe, that [m] *true perfection*

e *Auguſt. in Pſal. 142. Quare hoc dicitur &c. Quoniam non iuſtificabitur, &c.*

f *De ſpir. & lit. cap. 35. Sine exẽplo eſt in hominibus perfecta iuſtitia.*

g *De Temp. ſer. 49. Ipſa eſt perfectio hominum intuenti ſe non eſſe perfectum.*

h *De ſpir. & lit. ca. 36. In ea quæ perficienda eſt iuſtitia multum in hac vita ille profecit, qui quam longè ſit à perfectione iuſtitiæ proficiendo cognouit.*

i *De peccat. mer. & remiſſ. lib. 2. cap. 13. Perfectus viator eſt, ſi nondum erat itineris perfectione peruentor.*

k *De nat. & grat. cap. 12. Benè proficientes dicimur perfectiviatores.*

l *Hieron. contra Pelag. li. 1. Hæc eſt hominis vera ſapientia imperfectum eſſe ſe noſſe, atque vt ita loquar, cunctorum in carne iuſtorum imperfectè perfectus eſt.*

m *Ibid. lib. 3. Vera & abſque omni ſorde perfectio in cœleſtibus reſeruatur, quando ſponſus loquetur ad ſponſam, Tota pulchra es amica mea, & macula non eſt in te.*

which

*which is without all filth or vncleannesse, is reserued vnto heauen, when the bridegroome shall say to the bride, Thou art all faire, my loue, and there is not a spot in thee.* So saith *Fulgentius*, that [n] *there is yet no perfect perfection of the gifts of God, as where euery perfect man is yet wanting of perfection.* And this made *Origen* to say, that [o] *in this life wee may haue the image and shadow of vertues, but the vertues themselues when the things that are perfect shall come: and therefore that the iust man liueth rather, as he thinketh, in the shadow of vertues, then in the vertues themselues.* To which words accordeth that of *Hierome*, alluding to that of the Apostle whereto *Origen* alludeth, that [p] *wee know in part, and we see through a glasse in a darke speaking; and when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall bee done away.* [q] *We haue* (saith hee) *but in a shadow and an image the cleane heart, that shall after see God, and the happines of vnspotted life. Though a man be a Patriarch, though a Prophet, though an Apostle, yet is it said to them by our Sauiour, If yee being euill, &c.* Where is hee now that telleth vs of such a perfect righteousnesse in this life, as *faileth not of any duty that we are bound to performe*, when as there is heere none but *vnperfect perfection*, no man but that *wanteth of perfection*: when as we haue heere but the *image and shadow of vertues*, no perfection *without some filth or vncleannesse*, none but which leaueth vs still in case to be called *euill?* Whereby appeareth againe the absurdity of his third collection, that our perfection yeeldeth *such good works as merit euerlasting life.* It is true that *S. Austin* vseth the name of *merit*, but that by the name of *merits* hee meaneth simply *good workes*, to which God hath promised reward, and not any merit properly so called, shall heereafter appeare in the question of *merits.* In the meane time how farre hee was from that opinion of meriting, which *M. Bishop* heere would fasten vpon him, may appeare by the words cited by him out of *Hilary* against the Pelagian heretickes: [r] *Our hope is in the mercy of God for euer and euer: for the very workes of right eousnesse are not sufficient to the meriting of perfect blisse, vnlesse the mercy of God euen in this will of righteousnesse, doe forbeare to impute the vices or defaults of humane passions and affections.* Whereupon he himselfe saith: [s] *He confesseth the sinnes euen of iust men, affirming that they rather trust to the mercie of God, then haue any*

n *Fulgent. ad Monim lib. 1. Dimerum munerum nondum est perfecta perfectio, vbi non omnis perfectus perfectionis est indigus.*

o *Origen. aa Ro. cap. 6. In praesenti vita puto quod summam atq; vmbram virtutum tenere possimus, ipsas vero virtutes tunc cum venerint illa quae perfecta sunt: & ideo iustus magis vmbrae mihi videtur in vmbra virtutum quàm in ipsis virtutibus viuere.*

p *1. Cor. 13. 9. 10. 12.*

q *Hier. contra Pelag. li. 3. Mundum cor quod postea sit visurum Deum & vitae immaculatae lea-titudinem in vmbra possidemus & imagine. Quis Patriarcha sit aliquis, quamuis Propheta, quamuis Apostolus dicitur eis à Domino Saluatore, si vos cùm sitis mali, &c.*

r *Aug. contra Iulian. lib. 2. ex Hilar. in Psal. 51. Spes in misericordia Dei in seculis, & in seculum seculi. Non enim illa ipsa iustitiae opera ad perfectae beatitudinis sufficient meritum, nisi misericordia Dei etiam in hac iustitiae voluntate humanarum demutationum & motuum non reputet vitia.*

s *Ibid. Confitetur etiam peccata iustorum magis eos asserens in Dei misericordiae spem ponere quàm de iustitia sua fidere.*

any

any confidence of their owne righteousnesse. It is not therefore the merit of righteousnesse, that we can rest vpon, but onely the pardon of Gods mercie, by which as we haue obtained the gift of righteousnesse; so we expect also the reward and crowne thereof, that it may be verified which the Prophet saith: [t] *he crowneth thee in mercie and compassion:* and that of the Apostle, that *eternall life is the gift of God through Iesus Christ our Lord* Now to these collections *M. Bishop* addeth a caueat, that *this iustice though perfect in it selfe, so farre as mans capacity in this life doth permit, yet in comparison of the state of iustice in heauen may be called vnperfect.* Which is as much as if he should say, that it is perfect in it selfe, so farre as it may be perfect there where it cannot bee perfect. For there is not in this life any capacity of perfect righteousnesse, as wherein wee continue stil with the Apostle [u] *carnall sold vnder sinne, not doing the good that we would,* by reason of [x] *the flesh lusting against the spirit,* [y] *rebelling against the law of the minde, leading vs captiue to the law of sinne which is in our members,* so as that to auoide the enticements of the world, and to keepe our selues in our course entirely to God, is as *S. Ambrose* saith, [z] *a matter that we do more wish and desire then we can effect and do,* and when we haue laboured much for it, cannot but condemne our selues for beeing so farre from it. But against this deuice of his, we must note what hath bene said, that our perfection heere is not without *some filth,* and that it leaueth vs still euill, and therefore is not perfect in it selfe. Yea, and *S. Hierome* againe against the Pelagians distinguishing [a] two sorts of perfection and righteousnesse, *the one to be compared to the righteousnesse of God; the other belonging to the frailty of man,* denieth our perfection in this latter kinde, and saith, that in this sort it is true, that *no man liuing shall be iustified in Gods sight,* which he affirmeth to bee spoken *as touching a righteousnesse called perfect not by comparison, but in respect of the knowledge of God* The knowledge of God then which knoweth all things according to truth, yet knoweth no iustice or perfection in vs, whereby we are able to stand iust and perfect before him. Therefore *Gregory* saith, that [b] *our very perfection is not without fault, vnlesse the seuere Iudge do with mercy weigh it in the precise ballance of his examination* Neither is to be omitted which *S. Austine* saith, that [c] *all the life which we liue here,* that is, all

t Psal 103.4.

u Rom.7.14.19.
x Gal.5.17.
y Rom.7.23.
z Ambros. de fuga seculi.cap.1. *Res vt is magis quàm effectus.*
a Hieron.adu. Pelag.lib.1. *Perspicuum est duas in scripturis sanctis esse perfectiones, duasq; iustitias: Primam perfectionem & incomparabilem veritatè, perfectamque iustitiam Dei virtutibus coaptandam: secundam autem quæ competit: nostræ fragilitatis textu: a illud quod dicitur, Non iustificabitur, &c. ad eam iustitiam quæ non comparatione scientiæ Dei scientia æstimatur esse perfecta.*
b Grego.Moral. lib.5.cap.8. *Ipsa vestra perfectio culpa non caret nisi hanc fuerus iudex in subtilitate examinis vitæ iudicitis ponse.*
c Aug.de Temp. ser.49 *In comparatione resurrectionis illius sicut est tota ista vita quam gerimus. Vnusquisq; metiatur se quia est modo & quod erit tunc, & inuenit in comparatione illius ista damna esse & stercora.*

the

the righteousnesse of this life, *is but dung in comparison of the resurrection, that if a man measure himselfe what he is now and what he shall be then, hee shall finde that that which now is, is but losse and dung in comparison of that.* Which how can it bee true, if that that is in this life be perfect in it selfe, so perfect as that it faileth not in any duty which we are bound to performe; yea, as that it meriteth and deserueth the righteousnesse of heauen? Can that that in comparison is but drosse and dung, bee truly said to deserue the righteousnesse of heauen? But concerning the same, hee addeth further, that it is sufficient *to keepe vs from all formall transgression of Gods law.* So then thereby a man shall bee free from all formall sinne; and shall haue no formall trespasse for which to say, forgiue vs our trespasses; and of formall transgression it shall not be true which *S. Iohn* saith, [d] *If we say we haue no sinne we deceiue our selues*, or which *S. Iames* saith, [e] *In many things we offend all.* Is not this a formall foolery of a man that would be taken to be wise? These are drunken fancies, fit for no other but drunken men, that neither know themselues nor others, and therfore we can take *M. Bishop* for no other but a vile hypocrite, who contrary to his owne conscience and knowledge, pleadeth in this sort for the pefection of the righteousnesse of man. But to fill vp the measure of his lewd dealing, he falsifieth another place of *Austine*, making him to say, that *it belongeth to the lesser iustice, that is, the iustice of this life, not to sinne.* Wherein he goeth about to make *S. Austine* a promoter and vpholder of that heresie, which with all his might he oppugned in the Pelagians, who defended as *M. Bishop* here doth a righteousnesse in this life, whereby a man may be free from sin. And indeed the words which *M. Bishop* alledgeth out of *Austine*, are the aduersaries obiection, not the assertion of *Austin* himselfe. He bringeth them in by way of supposition what may be said, namely that [f] *there is a lesser righteousnes belonging to this life, wherin the iust liueth by faith, to which righteousnes it appertaineth not to sinne.* Which obiection hauing prosecuted more at large, and alledged what may be said for the maintenance thereof, he at length setteth down answer, wherof a part is contained in these words: [g] *Such iust men liuing by faith haue no need to say, forgiue vs our trespasses, & do conince it to be false, which is written, no man liuing*

d 1. Iohn. 1. 8.
e Iam. 3. 2.

f *Aug. de sp. & lit. ca. 36. Sed dicipotest quædam iustitia minor huius vitæ competens qua iustus ex fide vivit, &c. Non absurd dicitur etiam ad istam pertinere ne peccat.*

g *Ibid. Tales iustis ex fide viuentes non opus habent Deo dicere, Dimitte nobis, &c. Falsumque esse conuincit quod scriptum est, Non iustificabitur, &c.*

*Sed quia hæc falsa esse non possunt illud esse consequens video vt qualemlibet vel quantamlibet in hac vita potuerimus iustitiam iustitiam nullam in ea sit hominum qui nullam habeat omnino peccatum.*

shall

*ſhall be iuſtified in the ſight of God, and that, If we ſay we haue no ſinne, we deceiue our ſelues: and that there is not a man that ſinneth not: and that, There is not a man iuſt vpon the earth that doth good and ſinneth not. But becauſe theſe ſayings cannot be falſe, it followeth, that whatſoeuer, or how great ſoeuer we can define righteouſneſſe in this life, there is not a man therein that is without ſinne.* Where very plainely hee diſclaimeth the aſſertion of any righteouſneſſe in this life, in which that may be found that *M. Biſhop* ſpeaketh of: namely, not to ſinne. And ſurely had not this man a face of braſſe, and an iron conſcience, he would not in theſe dayes of light affirme a thing, or ſeeme to affirme it, ſo contrarie to the prepetuall doctrine and confeſſion of the Church. As for his diſtinction of veniall ſinnes, I haue before ſhewed it to bee friuolous and vaine, and the ſame (God willing) ſhall appeare further in the *Se*ction next ſaue one.

46. W. BISHOP.

Rom. 3.

*To theſe reaſons taken partly out of the Scriptures, and partly out of the record of Antiquitie let vs ioyne one or two drawne from the abſurditie of our aduerſaries doctrine, which teacheth euery good work of the righteous man to be infected with mortal ſinne: which by being granted, it would follow neceſſarily, that no good worke in the world, were to bee done vnder paine of damnation, thus:* No mortall ſinne is to bee done vnder paine of damnation: for the wages of ſinne is death: but all good works are ſtained with mortall ſinne, *ergo*, no good worke is to be done vnder paine of damnation. *It followeth ſecondly, that euery man is bound to ſinne deadly: for all men are bound to performe the duties of the firſt and ſecond table: but euery performance of any duty is neceſſarily linked with ſome mortall ſinne, therefore euery man is bound to commit many mortall ſins, and conſequently to be damned. Theſe are holy and comfortable concluſions, yet inſeparable companions, if not ſworne brethren of the Proteſtants doctrine. Now let vs hear what arguments they bring againſt this Catholike verity.*

R. ABBOT.

Here *M. Biſhop* hath learned from his fellow *M. Wright* to ſtrike the matter dead at one blow. Albeit, it is more likely, that theſe argu-

arguments going ſo currant amongſt them, were agreed vpon at *Wisbich* or ſome other like place, in ſome ſolemne aſſembly and conſultation, where the graue and reuerend companie of the Seculars laid their wits to gether, to giue the Proteſtants ſome inceitable and deadly blow. It is hard to thinke, that one or two mens wits ſhould ſerue to contriue ſuch a matter as here is againſt vs. Now if ſome young Sophiſter of the Vniuerſitie had ſtood by, and ſmiling at them had ſaid, that it was pitty that they good old men, ſhould be troubled with making of Syllogiſms, who had forgottē of how many *termes* a Syllogiſm doth conſiſt, would they not (think you) haue ſtartled at the hearing of it, and thought themſelues exceedingly diſgraced by a boy? Surely the arguments heere ſet downe are ſuch, as that if a boy in our Vniuerſities ſhold make the like in earneſt, he ſhould be thought iuſtly to deſerue the rod; & yet theſe are they who take vpon them, as if wee were to ſay vnto them: [a] *Becauſe you onely are men, wiſedome muſt dye with you.* He will proue by our doctrine, that *no good worke is to bee done vnder paine of damnation.* And how? forſooth *no mortall ſinne is to be done vnder paine of damnation: but all good works are ſtained with mortall ſinne*, ergo, *&c.* Did not his head ſerue him to know, that it is an error in arguing, when a Syllogiſme conſiſteth *ex quatuor terminis?* We haue *mortall ſinne* in the Maior propoſition, and in the Minor, *ſtained with mortall ſinne.* If he would haue kept the courſe of argument, hee muſt haue ſaid thus: *No mortall ſinne is to be done vnder paine of damnation; but all good works are mortall ſinnes*, ergo, *&c.* Which if hee had ſaid, the abſurdity of his minor propoſition had eaſily appeared, becauſe euery man could haue diſcerned, that good workes, though they haue ſome aſperſion or touch of our corruption, yet doe not thereby become ſinnes, no more then gold by his droſſe becometh earth or iron; no more then white linnen for ſome ſpot or ſtaine, is to be accounted blacke haire-cloth; no more then the day is to bee called night, becauſe it hath but ouercaſt and darkſome light. *S. Hierome* telleth vs, that [b] *When S. Iohn ſaith, that there is no darkneſſe found in the light of God, he ſheweth, that all others lights are blotted with ſome vncleanneſſe. The Apoſtles* (ſaith he) *are called the light of the world, but it is not written that there was no darkneſſe in the Apoſtles light:* And what? will *M. Biſhop* conclude, that becauſe there was ſome darknes in the Apoſtles light, therefore their light was

[a] Iob. 12. 2.

[b] *Hier. aduerſ. Pelag. lib. 2. Quando dicit nullas tenebras in Dei lumine reperiri, oſtendit omnia aliorum lumina ſorde aliqua maculari. Denique & Apoſtoli appellantur lux mundi, ſed non eſt ſcriptum quod in Apoſtolorum luce nulle ſint tenebræ.*

darkneſſe and not light? If he will not ſo conclude, then let him ſay, that it followeth not that good workes are ſinnes, albeit in our doing of them they receiue ſome blemiſh and ſtaine of ſinne. But to ſhew vs ſomewhat more of the ſweat and ſuperfluity of his learning, he hath added another argument of the like feature, to proue that by our doctrine *euery man is bound to ſinne deadly*. And why ſo? becauſe *all men are bound to performe the duties of the firſt and ſecond Table, and euery performance thereof is neceſſarily linked with mortall ſinne*. Which is as if a man ſhould reaſon thus: A lame man is bound by law to come to the Church; but he cannot come to the Church but hee muſt halt, therefore hee is bound by law to halt. *M. Biſhop* is bound to pay a man twenty pounds, but he cannot tell the mony without ſoyling his fingers: therefore hee is bound to ſoile his fingers. He can no way inferre his concluſion, but by a ſophiſticall cauillation, which the Logicians call *fallaciam accidentis*, whereby in the concluſion he inferreth that of the accident, which in the premiſſes is referred onely to the ſubiect, his argument by that meanes wholly without forme, and offending in the like ſort as the other did. Bring it into his due faſhion, and euery child then ſhal ſee, that his proofe is moſt ridiculous and abſurd. For to bring in his concluſion, his argument muſt be this: Whoſoeuer is bound to do the duties of the firſt and ſecond Table, is bound to ſinne. But euery man is bound to doe the duties of the firſt and ſecond Table; therefore euery man is bound to ſinne. His Proſyllogiſme for the proofe of his maior propoſition out of his owne words muſt ariſe thus: Whoſoeuer neceſſarily ſinneth in doing the duties of the firſt and ſecond Table, is bound to ſinne: but whoſoeuer is bound to do the duties of the firſt and ſecond Table, neceſſarily ſinneth in the doing thereof: therefore whoſoeuer is bound to do the duties of the firſt and ſecond Table is bound to ſinne. Heere his maior propoſition is apparently abſurd: for though a man by reaſon of infirmitie cannot but ſinne in doing his duty, yet it is the duty onely that he is bound to, and not to the ſinne, becauſe the ſinne is not implied in the dutie, but ariſeth by caſuall and accidentall neceſſitie from the condition of the man. Now therefore a man may doubt whether is greater in this man, his malice or his ignorance. In reſpect of his malice we may vſe to him the words of the Prophet *Dauid*: [c] *Thy tongue imagineth wickednes, and with lies thou cutteſt like a ſharp razor: Thou haſt*

[c] Pſal. 52. 3. 5.

*haſt loued to ſpeake all words that may do hurt, O thou falſe tongue.* In reſpect of his ignorance, we may iuſtly ſcorne him as a preſumptuous and ſawcie companion, who being of ſo baſe quality, and not knowing how to frame an argument aright, would take vpon him to encounter a whole army of learned men, and ſo inſolently dedicate his vnlearned fooleries to the King.

## 47. W. BISHOP.

*Firſt, they alledge theſe words*: Enter not, O Lord, into iudgment with thy ſeruant, becauſe no liuing creature ſhall be iuſtified in thy ſight. *If none can be iuſtified before God, it ſeemes that none of their works are iuſt in his ſight.* Pſal. 141.

Anſwer. *There are two common expoſitions of this place among the ancient Fathers: both true, but farre from the Proteſtants purpoſe. The former is* S. Auguſtines, S. Ieromes, S. Gregories *in his Commentaries vpon that place: who ſay, that no creature ordinarily liueth without many veniall ſinnes, for the which in iuſtice they may be puniſhed ſharply either in this life, or elſe afterward in Purgatory. Wherfore the beſt men do very prudently pray vnto God, not to deale with them according vnto their deſerts: for if he ſhould ſo do, they cannot be iuſtified and cleared from many veniall faults. And therefore they muſt all craue pardon for theſe faults, or elſe indure Gods iudgements for them, before they can attaine vnto the reward of their good deeds. The ſecond expoſition is more ordinary with all the beſt Writers vpon the Pſalmes: as* S. Hilarie, S. Hierome, S. Arnobius, S. Euthimius, *and others: which is alſo* S. Auguſtins, S. Gregories. *All theſe ſay, that mans iuſtice in compariſon of the iuſtice of God, will ſeeme to be no iuſtice at all: and ſo take theſe words*, No creature, *neither man nor Angell*, ſhall be iuſtified in thy ſight: *that is, if his iuſtice appeare before thine, and be compared to it. For as the ſtars be bright in themſelues, & ſhine alſo goodly in a clear night, yet in the preſẽce of the glittering Sun beams, they appear not at all: euen ſo mans iuſtice, although conſidered by it ſelfe it be great & perfect in his kind, yet ſet in the ſight & preſẽce of Gods iuſtice, it vaniſheth away, and is not to be ſeene. This expoſition is taken out of* Iob, *where he ſaith*: I know truly it is euen ſo, that no man cõpared to God, ſhall be iuſtified. *Take the words of the Pſalm in whether ſence you liſt (that either we haue many veniall faults, for which he cannot be iuſtified in* De perfiuſtit. Epiſt. ad Creſ. Lib. 1. ad Croſiũ cap. 10. lib. 5. moral. cap. 1. Iob. 9.

*Gods ſight, or elſe that in the ſight of Gods moſt bright iuſtice, ours will not appeare at all) and it cannot be thereof iuſtly concluded, that euery worke of the righteous man is ſtained with ſinne: and conſequently, the place is not to purpoſe.*

R. ABBOT.

I would wiſh thee (gentle Reader) well to obſerue *M. Biſhops* twofold anſwer to this place. The more clear theſe words of Scripture are againſt the inherent righteouſneſſe of man, the more notably his ſingular impudency appeareth in ſeeking to ſhift them off. *Dauid* ſaith it, a Prophet ſaith it, a man after Gods own heart ſaith it: [a] *Enter not into iudgement with thy ſeruant, O Lord, for no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified (or found iuſt) in thy ſight.* Now *M. Biſhop* anſwereth, that this is ſpoken in reſpect of *veniall ſinnes, without which no creature liueth, & for which a man may in iuſtice be puniſhed ſharpely, either in this life or in Purgatory.* Where it is to bee obſerued, that hee hath told vs in the Section laſt ſaue one, that *veniall ſinne is no formall tranſgreſſion of Gods law*, by reaſon whereof they hold, that [b] *veniall ſinnes conſiſt with true iuſtice*, and hinder it not. So ſaith *Andradius*, [c] *They can noway ouerthrow iuſtice, nor in any ſort hinder the perfect and abſolute obedience of the law.* So then *Dauids* prayer muſt be this: *Enter not into iudgement with me for veniall ſinnes: for by reaſon of veniall ſinnes which hinder not, but that a man is iuſt, no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified in thy ſight.* Which expoſitiō being apparently lewd and ſhameleſſe, yet he hath learned of his maiſter *Bellarmine* to countenance it with the names of them who neuer thought any ſuch thing. He alledgeth *Auſtin*, who in the place by him cited hath not a word to that effect, which maketh him to ſet none downe, becauſe indeed there are none. But in the place mentioned the ſame *Auſtin* rightly ſaith, [d] *Were it not that mercy reioyceth ouer iudgement, what hope ſhould there be? For when the iuſt King ſhall ſit vpon his throne, who ſhall glory that hee hath a cleane heart, or reioyce that he is free from ſinne?* If no man ſhall bee able then to challenge to himſelfe a cleane heart, where is that perfect iuſtice of workes which *Maſter Biſhop* dreameth of, which cannot come but from *a cleane heart*? Hee citeth in the ſecond place the reuerend Father *Saint Hierome*, who beſide that he ſaith nothing for him, ſpeaketh expreſly and directly againſt him.

a Pſal. 143. 2.

b *Rhem. Teſtam. 1. Ioh. 1. 8.*

c *Andread. Orth. explicat. l. 5. Iuſtitiam euertere nullo pacto poſſit neque perfectam & abſolutam legi obedientiam quoquo modo impedire.*

d *Aug. de perfect. iuſtit. Superexaltat miſericordia iudicio. Quod ſi nō eſſet, quæ ſpes eſſet? Quandoquidem cum rex iuſtus ſederit in throno, quis gloriabitur ſe caſtum habere cor, aut quis gloriabitur ſe eſſe immunē à peccato?*

[e] *When*

*c When the Prophet saith, In thy sight, he will haue it to be vnderstood, that euen they which seem holy vnto men, are not holy to the notice and knowledge of God. for man seeth in the face, but God in the heart. Now if in the sight and beholding of God, whom the secrets of the heart cannot deceiue, no man be iust, it is plainely shewed that the heretikes (in affirming men to be iust) do not lift vp man, but detract from the power of God.* Hee affirmeth that by the place it is proued, that to the knowledge and sight of God no man is iust, and *M. Bishop* maketh him a witnesse, that the Prophet speaketh of veniall sinnes, which are nolet, but that a man is iust. In the like fraudulent manner he nameth *Gregorie*, whose words are these; ** I know that many seeme iust in the sight of men, and being lifted vp to the hope of heauenly promises, do liue innocently in the world, who albeit they offend not in deede or worke, yet do sometimes fall by vaine and peruerse cogitation and thought. For whose minde do not vaine thoughts wound? whose heart do not temptations afflict? whose minde do not fleshly desires trouble? Therefore he is not iustified in the sight of God who offendeth in the heart which God beholdeth.* Now who would not wonder that *M. Bishop* should referre himselfe to these words for the exposition that he maketh of the place here in hand? And yet why should we wonder? for his maister *Bellarmine* had so alledged it; and that was enough: whether truly or falsly, what was that to him? But how farre *Gregorie* was from that which he would so faine fasten vpon him, appeareth by that that was a little before cited out of him, as also in that he saith, that *f euen the elect howsoeuer they excell in righteousnesse, haue not sufficient to approue themselues innocent, if they be narrowly sifted in iudgment.* Therefore not for veniall sinnes which hinder not a man from being iust, but for such sinnes as bereaue a man of the title of iustice and innocencie, doth the Prophet desire that God will not enter into iudgment with him. *M. Bishops* other answer is taken from an exposition, which he saith *is more ordinary with al the best writers vpon the Psalmes*, and yet indeede is no other but a meere Pelagian shift; that is, *that mans iustice in comparison of the iustice of God, will seeme to be no iustice at all*, euen as the Sunne drowneth the light of the starres

c Hieron ad Crespbon. Quando dicit, In conspectu tuo, hoc intelligi vult, quod etiam qui hominibus sancti videntur, Dei sciuntiæ atq; notitiæ nequaquã sancti sunt. Homo enim videt in facie, Deus in corde. Si autem inspiciante Deo & omnis contemplante quem cordis arcana non fallunt, nullus est iustus, perspicuè ostenditur hæreticos no hominum in excelsa sustollere sed potentiæ Dei derogare.

* Greg. in sept. Psal. pœnitent. Scio multos in conspectu hominum iustos videri, & ad spem cœlestium promissorum electos innocenter in mundo viuere, qui etsi non delinquant in opere, labuntur tamen aliquando vana aut peruersa cogitatione. Cuius enim mentem vanæ cogitationes non lacerant? Cuius cor tentationes non vexant? Cuius animum desideria carnis non turbant? Non ergo in conspectu Dei iustificatur, qui corde delinquit quando intuetur Deum.

f Greg. Moral. lib 8. cap. 22. Quamuis alibi iustitia polleant nequaquam sibi ad innocentiam vel electi sufficiunt si districte iudicio requirantur.

that it appeareth not. *Hierom* hauing mentioned the words in question against the Pelagians, addeth thereupon; [g] *Which testimonie vnder the name of pietie they delude with a new shift. They say, that in comparison of God no man is perfect. As if this were it,* saith he, *that the Scripture speaketh of*; & so he goeth on with the words which I cited out of him last before. That is not then by S. *Hieromes* testimonie that the Scripture meaneth when it saith, that *no man liuing shall be iustified in Gods sight*. For shal we be so mad as to think, that we are taught to pray to God not to enter into iudgment with vs, because our righteousnesse is not comparable to his? Where hath God required it so to be? [h] *Hath God,* saith Hierom, *commanded me to be the same that God is? That there should be no difference betwixt me and the Lord my creator? that I should be aboue the height of Angels? that I should haue that which the Angles haue not?* Shall we thinke that the Creator will be offended, because his creature is not the same that he himselfe is? or that God will enter into iudgment with vs because we were not made Gods? If this be absurd, as indeede it is, then we must confesse, that therfore the Prophet teacheth vs by his example so to pray, because according to that righteousnesse that is commanded vnto vs and belongeth to our dutie, we are found greatly defectiue and wanting in the sight of God, as in the former section also I haue shewed that *Hierom* expoundeth that place. As for them whom *M. Bishop* citeth to warrant his exposition, he doth notably abuse them. First *Hilary* indeed speaketh of comparisō to God, but not as touching degree of righteousnesse, in which there can be no comparison, because the one is finite and the other finite, but as touching an vniformitie and constant tenour of righteousnesse, whereby man should inuiolably and vnmoueably without interruption continue in that righteousnesse that concerneth him, as God doth in his righteousnesse. This he expresseth when he saith, that [i] *God doth not measure these slippery fals of our changeable nature according to the inflexible constancy of his vnchaungeable substance, but in iustice and moderation expecteth so much of man as he remembreth the nature of man can reach vnto.* For so is his promise *in our willing minde to accept vs according to that that we haue*, as the Apostle speaketh in another case. To this meaning he saith; [k] *What hope is there if God will haue vs*

to

g Hieron. ad Ctesiphont. Non iustificeb. sur, &c. Quod testimoniū sub nomine pietatis noua argumentatione deludunt.

Aliud ad comparationem Dei nullum esse perfectum. Quasi scriptura hoc dixerit.

h Ibid. Numquid praecepit mihi Deus vt essem quod Deus est? vt nihil inter me esset & Dominū creatorem? vt ma or essem Angelorum fastigio? vt haberem quod Angeli non habent?

i Hilar. in Psal. 142. Non hos demutabilis naturae nostrae promptissimos lapsus secundum indemutabilis substantiae sinceritatem exam. constantiam metiatur, sed iustus & moderans tantum ab homine expectat quantū humana memineris licere nature.

k Ibid. Quid spei est si iudicari nos secundū se Deus velit? si ad comparationem suae vitae nostrae innocentiam postulabit?

*to be iudged according to himselfe; if he shall require the innocencie of our life in comparison of him*: that is, to bee as free from slippes and fals in our state as he is in his? And to shew that man being subiect to alterations and changes is not iust in Gods sight, according to the righteousnes that concerneth him in his own state, he addeth:

[1] *And what man liuing can be iustified in Gods sight, with whom anger, and griefe, and lust, and ignorance, and forgetfulnesse, & casualty, and necessity, are blended and mingled either by the nature of the body, or by the motion of the euer-wauering soule; who also hath daily a grieuous enemie at hand, euen the diuell lying in waite against the soule of the faithfull man, and persecuting the same to destroy it? For this doth the Prophet teach to bee the cause, why no man liuing can bee found iust in the sight of God.* By which words being verie cleare & manifest, the reader may esteeme with what fidelity *M. Bishop* hath brought *Hilary* to iustifie his exposition of that place. With the like truth or rather vntruth, hee citeth *Hierome*, who saith, that [m] *the Prophet doth manifestly shew, that he did waite for Gods mercy*, that he supposeth *some one to be iudge, betwixt God and him; which so beeing, God should be iustified in his sayings, and ouercome when he is iudged: who therefore entreth into iudgement that he may iustly punish.* Then reckoning *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Iacob* amongst them of whom the Prophet speaketh; he inferreth: [n] *Therefore not the very Patriarks themselues shall bee found iust in the sight of God: for euen the starres are not cleane in his sight.* What can be more plainely spoken, to shew that euen the most righteous and iust for want of puritie and iustice should iustly be punished, if God should enter into iudgment with them; and that if the verie starres, not by their owne sin, but by being in the ° *bondage of our vanitie and corruption*, be found vncleane before God, much more are we vncleane, for whose sake it is that that imputation doth lie vpon them? But to make it yet further to appeare what *Hierome* conceiued of those wordes, hee saith in another place: [p] *When the day of iudgement or death shall come, all hands shall be faint, because no work shall be found worthy of the iustice of God, and no man liuing shall be iustified in his sight.* Where he plainly teacheth, not onely as touching comparison to God, but as touching that a iust man in himself ought to be, that no man liuing, no

1 *Ibid Iustificari in conspectu Dei quis uiuentium potest, cui ira, cui dolor, cui cupiditas, cui obliuio, cui ignoratio, cui casus, cui necessitas vel per naturam corporis, vel per motum semper fluentis animæ admixta sunt? Cui & quotidiè grauissimus hostis imminet, diabolus videlicet animæ viri fidelis insidians, eamque ad interitum persequens? Hanc enim esse causam docet, qua nemo viuens iustificari in conspectu Dei possit.*

m *Hieron. in Psal. 142. Manifestissimè demonstrauit, quia misericordiæ Dei præstolatur, &c. Hic quasi aliquis iudicet inter Deum & Prophetam, sicut & scriptum est, vt iustificeris, &c. Et propterea intrat in iudicium Deus vt iustè puniat.*

n *Ergo nec ipsi Patriarchæ iustificabuntur in conspectu Dei. Stellæ enim non sunt mundæ in conspectu eius.*

° Rom. 8. 20. 21.

p *Hieron. in Esa. lib. 6. cap. 14. Cùm dies iudicij vel dormitionis aduenerit, dissoluentur omnes manus, quia nullum opus dignum Dei iustitia reperietur, & non iustificabitur, &c.*

not ſo much as in any one worke ſhall bee iuſtified in Gods ſight, but his hands, that is, all his workes ſhall faile if God enter into iudgement with him. The next that he citeth is *Arnobius*, who for one part of his expoſition of theſe words, ſaith, that man is not to be found righteous if he bee compared to God; that [q] *all beauty in Gods preſence is but deformity, all ſtrength but weakeneſſe, all riches but beggerie, all righteouſneſſe but vnrighteouſneſſe.* But hauing ſet downe this becauſe this could not ſufficiently expreſſe the meaning of the Prophe, he addeth further: [r] *And I pray thee that thou wilt ceaſe to ſearch out the righteouſneſſe that concerneth man, that ſhould be neighbour to thy righteouſneſſe, becauſe the enemie hath perſecuted my ſoule, and compaſſed me about with ſuch darkeneſſe of his deceipt, as that beleeuing my ſelfe to be dead with God, I thought I ſhould finde no hearing with thy righteouſneſſe for my recouerie: therefore is my ſpirit troubled within mee.* It is plaine then by the iudgement of *Arnobius*, that not onely in compariſon of God, but euen by that righteouſneſſe that belongeth vnto man, no man liuing ſhall bee found iuſt before the iudgement ſeat of God. *Euthymius* whom he alledgeth next, is as plaine to the ſame purpoſe. For although with *Arnobius* hee on the one ſide denie iuſtification in compariſon of God, *in compariſon of whom*, ſaith he, *not onely man, but neither the Angels themſelues are iuſt, becauſe it is he onely that is not capable of ſinne*, yet not contented herewith, he on the other ſide expounderh the praier of the Prophet in this ſort; [t] *Enter not into iudgement, &c. that is, deale not ſtrictly with me in the time to come: I fly vnto thee, and am not worthy to be called thy ſonne, neither will I enter into iudgement with thee, neither do I ſet vp mine owne righteouſneſſe, becauſe it ſhall not bee iuſtified heere in the fleſh, where no man liuing is perfectly cleane.* He further addeth reaſons of the vſing of this praier, [t] *becauſe wee daily ſinne; becauſe wee doe few good deedes in compariſon of that that wee commit* (in euill) *and omit* (in good): *becauſe wee doe little good in compariſon of the beneſittes of God.* Now then what is become of Maſter *Biſhops* righteouſneſſe, *ſo perfect as that it faileth not in any duetie which wee are bound to performe*; yea, ſuch as *by which wee merit euerlaſting life?* Compare the one with the other, gentle Reader, and thou ſhalt ſee how well they agree.

q *Arnob. in Pſal. 142. Omnis pulchritudo te præſente deformis eſt: omnis fortitudo infirma; omnes diuitiæ mendicitas: omnis humana iuſtitia iniuſtitia.*

r *Ibid. Et vt vicinam tuæ iuſtitiæ iuſtitiam humanã exquirere deſinas quæſo, quoniam perſecutus eſt inimicus animam meam, &c. Tanta me obſcuritate ſuæ circumdedit fraudis vt mortuum me apud Deum credens, putarem me nullum recuperationis apud iuſtitiam tuam auditum inuenire: ideo anxiatus eſt in me ſpiritus meus.*

t *Euthym. in Pſal. 142. Ideſt, non diſtrictè mecum agas in ſeuero: adite fugio & non ſum dignus vocari ſilius tuus, nec ego tecum intrare in iudicium volo, nec conſtituo iuſtitiam meam quòd non iuſtificabitur hic in carne, vbi nemo hic viuens plenè mũdus eſt.*

t *Ibidem. Quotidiè peccamus: Pauca bona facimus in comparatione commiſſionis & omiſſionis: minima bona facimus in comparatione beneficiorum Dei.*

*S. Auſtine.*

S. *Auſtine* in the place alledged, hath nothing at all concerning this text, nothing at all concerning the righteouſneſſe of man. Only he ſaith of the Angels, that [u] *although by participation of God they be iuſt, yet in compariſon of God they be not iuſt.* Now if the Prophets words be to be taken as *M. Biſhop* conſtrueth them, then this praier muſt bee the praier of Angels as well as of men, becauſe by the teſtimonie of *Auſtine*, which *Euthymius* alſo obſerueth, the very Angels themſelues are not iuſt in compariſon of God. Now wee doe not any where finde that it belongeth to the Angels to praie in this ſort, and therefore it muſt be ſo vnderſtood as is proper vnto men. And that vnderſtanding thereof, the ſame S. *Auſtine* declareth to vs writing vpon that Pſalme: [x] *Howſoeuer I ſeeme to my ſelfe right & ſtraight, yet thou bringeſt a rule out of thy treaſurie; thou laieſt mee to it, and I am found faultie.* The words therefore import that not only by compariſon, but by rule of righteouſneſſe which God hath preſcribed to man, euerie man liuing is found failing of righteouſneſſe in the ſight of God, euen as elſewhere he ſaith: [y] *According to the moſt entire rule of his truth, no man liuing ſhall bee iuſtified in his ſight.* Which he declareth yet more plainly in his foreſaid expoſition vpon the Pſalme, when he teacheth that by the ſame defaults for which we praie daily vnto God, *forgiue vs our treſpaſſes*, it commeth to paſſe that no man liuing ſhall bee iuſtified in Gods ſight: [z] *Let the Apoſtles themſelues ſay, let them ſay, forgiue vs our treſpaſſes. And when it ſhall be ſaid vnto them, why do ye ſay thus? What are your treſpaſſes? let them anſwer: Becauſe no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified in thy ſight.* *Gregories* minde is ſufficiently plaine by that that hath beene ſaid before. For what though hee ſay that the righteouſneſſe of men & Angels is nothing in compariſon of God? Doth that import that there is nothing elſe meant by the Prophet, when hee praieth vnto God not to enter into iudgement with him? By this then wee may ſee the lewd conſciences of theſe men in citing the authorities of the ancient Fathers. Hee hath brought vs heere a great companie of their names for him, when there is not one of them but ſpeaketh expreſly againſt him, and the moſt of them in the ſelfe ſame places whence he alledgeth them. But he telleth vs further, that his expoſition is taken out of *Iob*, from whom hee alledgeth theſe words; [a] *I know truly it is euen ſo, that no man compared to God ſhall be iuſtified.* In which ſort it is true, that we alſo read the

u *Aug. tom. 7. lib. ſi. ſtill. & Origen. ad Oreſ. cap. 10. Cuius participatione iuſti ſunt, eius comparatione non iuſti ſunt.*

x *Idem in Pſal. 142. Quantumlibet rectum mihi videor, proluctus tu de theſauro tuo regulam; coeptas mihi adeam & fragui imuenior.*

y *Idem de peccat. mer. & remiſ. lib. 2. cap. 10. Quantum ad intergerrimam regulam veritatis eius pertinet, non iuſtificabitur, &c.*

z *Idem in Pſal. 142. Dicant Apoſtoli, dicant, Dimitte nobis, &c. Et cùm eu dictum fuerit, Quare hoc dicis? que ſunt debita veſtra? reſpondeant. Quoniam non iuſtificabitur, &c.*

a Iob. 9. 2.

the wordes in ſome of our tranſlations, but it is true alſo that the word of compariſon is not at all found in the Hebrew text. Therefore *Arias Montanus* tranſlateth it *adverbum* thus: [b] *Why will a man iuſtifie himſelfe with God?* Pagnine thus; [c] *How will a man iuſtifie himſelfe with God? S. Auguſtine* alſo readeth to the ſame effect, [d] *How ſhall a man be iuſt before God?* Therefore theſe wordes of *Iob* haue nothing at all, whereupon that expoſition of his may haue any ground. And though *Iob* had ſaid, that man in compariſon of God is not iuſt or cannot be iuſtified, yet it followeth not that that therefore ſhould be all that *Dauid* meant in ſaying, that *no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified in Gods ſight.* And that appeareth by *S. Auſtine* in the place now alledged, where bringing in the words of *Iob*; [e] *If I ſhall call my ſelfe iuſt, my mouth ſhall ſpeake wickedly*; hee expoundeth the ſame thus; [f] *If I ſhall call my ſelfe iuſt againſt his iudgement where the perfect rule of righteouſneſſe proueth me to be vniuſt, ſurely my mouth ſhall ſpeake wickedly*, and in reſpect hereof ſaith, that thoſe wordes were vſed by *Dauid: Enter not into iudgement, &c.* For this cauſe then are wee taught ſo to pray, *becauſe the perfect rule of righteouſnes proueth vs to be vniuſt* if God enter into iudgment with vs. By this place therefore wee wholly ouerthrow the righteouſneſſe of man, and do firmely prooue, that no man liuing either generally in the courſe of his life, or in any particular act or acts can be iuſtified before God, if God call him to the triall of the preciſe and perfect rule of righteouſneſſe and truth. Yea, if no man can be found iuſt in the ſight of God, then it muſt neceſſarily follow, that no act of man can bee found iuſt, becauſe the act muſt needes bee according to the condition and quality of the man, ſo that vnleſſe a man be fully and perfectly iuſt, no act fully and perfectly iuſt can proceede from him, but muſt needes haue a ſtaine of that ſin which bereaueth him of the title of a iuſt man.

b *Quid iuſtificabit ſe homo cum Deo?*
c *Quomod. iuſtificabit ſe homo cum Deo?*
d *Aug. de pecc. mer. & remiſſ. lib. 2 cap. 10. Quemadmodum iuſtus erit homo ante Deum?*
e Iob. 10.
f *Aug. ibid. Si me iuſtum dixero contra iudicium eius vbi perfecta illa iuſtitiæ regula me conuincit iniuſtū, profecto impie loquetur os meum.*

## 48. W. Bishop.

*One other ordinary hackney of theirs, is that out of the Prophet.* Eſay 64. All our righteouſneſſe is as a menſtruous or defiled cloath. *The which I haue already ridde to death in the beginning of the queſtion of iuſtification, where it was alledged: The anſwer is briefly, that the Prophet praying for the ſinnes of the people, ſpeaketh in the perſon of the*

*the ſinfull; ſuch as the common ſort of them were, who had more ſinnes then good workes, and ſo their righteouſneſſe was like vnto a ſpotted and ſtayned cloath. Now this diſproueth not, but that their good workes although but few, yet were free from all ſpots of iniquitie: it onely prooueth, that with their few good, they had a great number of euill, which defiled their righteouſneſſe, and made it like a ſtanied cloath.*

R. ABBOT.

He hath ſo rid this hackney of ours, as that he hath pitifully galled himſelfe in the riding of him. We do imagine that by that time he hath better aduiſed of this whole matter, he will thinke that ſome body did ride him when firſt he tooke this buſineſſe in hand. We may here ſee the blinde inſolencie of a preſumptuous vaine man, who hauing ſaid nothing but what is iuſtly to be derided and ſcorned, yet taketh vpon him as if he had giuen vs ſome very admirable and learned anſwer. Yea, in this very place he bableth as if his wits were to ſeeke, croſſing and thwarthing that in one line which he vttereth in another. He telleth vs that the words of *Eſay* were ſpoken *in the perſon of the ſinfull, who had more ſinnes then good workes, and ſo their righteouſneſſe was like vnto a ſpotted and ſtained cloath*: and yet by and by he ſaith, that *their good workes though but few, were free from all ſpots of iniquitie.* Againe, as vncertaine where to ſtand, he telleth vs, that *their euill works defiled their righteouſneſſe, and made it like a ſtained cloath.* If their good works were free from al ſpots of iniquity, how did their euil works defile them, and make them like a ſtained cloath? Or if their euill works did defile their good, and make them like a ſtained cloath, how were they free from all ſpots of iniquitie? Againe, we would demaund of him, how ſinfull, or as he hath called them before, euill and wicked men ſhould do good workes free from all ſpots of iniquitie, ſeeing our Sauiour ſo plainly ſaith, that [a] *an euill tree cannot bring forth good fruite*, no more then *we can gather grapes of thornes or figges of thiſtles. S. Paul* telleth vs, that [b] *to them that are vncleane nothing is pure, their mindes and conſciences being defiled.* Which made *S. Bernard* to ſay, that [c] *if there be a blemiſh or blot in the conſcience, nothing that commeth from it ſhall be without a blot.* How then can it ſtand good which *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *ſinfull and wicked*

a Mat. 7. 18. Luk. 6. 43.

b Tit. 2. 15.

c Bern. in Cant. Ser. 71. Si ſuerit macula in conſcientia, nec quod ex ea prodierit carebit macula.

*wicked men do good workes which are free from all ſpots of iniquitie?* But thus he turneth all vpſide downe, and according to the preſent occaſion, letteth goe whatſoeuer commeth next to hand, without feare or wit. But vpon the place I neede not to ſtand. I referre the Reader to that that hath bene [d] before ſaid thereof, where it hath bene ſhewed, that the Prophet by way of prophecie endited the praier in the name of the faithfull that were to liue in the deſolations of Ieruſalem and the Temple; that the praier of the Prophet *Daniel*, at that time fully expreſſeth the effect of the ſame praier of *Eſay*: and therefore that it is the cõfeſſion of the faithfull & godly, that their righteouſneſſe is as a ſtained cloth, and that the auncient Fathers haue vſed the place for proofe thereof.

d Sect 3.

## 49. W. Bishop.

3. There is not a man who doth not ſinne: *And* bleſſed is the man whoſe ſinnes be not imputed to him; *and ſuch like. I anſwer that the beſt men ſinne venially, and are happy when thoſe their ſinnes be pardoned: but all this is cleane beſides this queſtion, where it is onely enquired, whether the good workes that the iuſt do, be free from ſinne, and not whether they at other times do ſinne, at the leaſt venially. This is all which* M. Perkins *here & there obiecteth againſt this matter: but becauſe ſome others do alledge alſo ſome darke places out of the Fathers, I thinke it not amiſſe to ſolue them here together.*

S. Cyprian *ſaith:* That the beſieged mind of man, can hardly reſiſt all aſſaults of the enemie: for when couetouſneſſe is ouerthrowne, vp ſtarts lechery, and ſo forth.

Anſwer. *All this is true, that the life of man is a perpetuall warfare: yea man aſſiſted with the grace of God, may performe it moſt valiantly, and neuer take any mortall wound of the enimies: although through his own frailty he may be ſometimes foiled.*

Dial. 1. cap. Pelag.

S. Hierom *affirmeth*: That then we are iuſt when we confeſſe our ſelues to be ſinnes.

Anſwer. *That all iuſt men confeſſe themſelues to ſinne venially. but neither of theſe places come neare the point in queſtion, that not one good deede of the iuſt man, is without ſome ſpot or ſtaine of ſinne.*

Epiſt. 29.

S. Auſtine *hath theſe words*: Moſt perfect charity which cannot be encreaſed, is to beſound in no man in this life: and as long as it may

may be encreaſed, that which is leſſe thē it ought to be, is faulty, of which fault it proceedeth, that there is no man who doth good, and doth not ſinne. *All this we grant to be true: that no man hath ſo perfect charity in this life, but that ſometimes he doth leſſe then hee ought to do: and conſequently doth not ſo well, but that now and then he ſinneth at the leaſt venially, and that therfore the ſaid holy Doctor had iuſt cauſe to ſay:* Wo be to the laudable life of a man, if it bee examined without mercy. *All which notwithſtanding iuſt men may out of that charity which they haue in this life do many good workes, which are pure from al ſinne, as hath bene proued. They alledge yet another place out of S. Auſtine:* That belongeth vnto the perfection of a iuſt man, to know in truth his imperfectiō, and in humility to confeſſe it. *True: that is, as he teacheth elſe-where: Firſt, that the perfection of this life is imperfection, being compared with the perfection of the life to come. Again, that the moſt perfect in this life, hath many imperfections, both of wit and will, and thereby many light faults.*

Lib. 9. conſeſſ. cap. 13.

Lib. 3. con. duas Epiſt. Pelag. cap. 7

*Now come we vnto* S Gregory *our bleſſed Apoſtle, out of whoſe ſweet words ill vnderſtood, they ſeeme to haue ſucked this their poiſon. He ſaith:* The holy man *Iob*, becauſe he did ſee all the merit of our vertue to be vice, if it be ſtraightly examined of the inward Iudge, doth rightly adde, if I will contend with him, I cannot anſwer him one for a thouſand.

Lib. 9. moral. cap. 1.

*I anſwer, that by our vertue in that place, is to bee vnderſtood, that vertue which we haue of our owne ſtrength, without the aide of Gods grace; which we acknowledge to be commonly infected with ſome vice: that* S. Gregory *ſo tooke it, appeares by the words, both going before and following: before he writeth thus:* A man not compared to God, receiued iuſtice: but compared vnto him, he leeſeth it. For whoſoeuer compareth himſelfe vnto the author of all good, leeſeth that good which he had receiued: for hee that doth attribute the good vnto himſelfe, doth fight againſt God with his owne gifts: *And after thus:* To contend with God, is not to giue to God the glory of his vertue, but to take it to himſelfe. *And ſo all the merit of this our vertue, which commeth not of God, but is attributed vnto our ſelfe, as proceeding onely from our ſelues, is the very vice of pride, and cannot be preiudicial vnto true good works, all which wee acknowledge to proceede principally from the grace of God dwelling in vs.* Hee ſaith further with S. Auguſtine, *that in this life we cannot attaine vnto perfect*

*fect purity, ſuch as ſhall bee in heauen, reade the beginning of his firſt and ſecond booke of Morals, and there you ſhall finde him commending* Iob *to the skies, as a good and holy man, by his temptation not foiled, but much aduanced in vertue.*

R. ABBOT.

Theſe arguments the moſt of them are foiſted in of his owne head, there being none of ours that alledgeth them to that purpoſe to which he produceth them. But thus becauſe he would bee taken for a valiant warriour he maketh himſelfe a man of ſtraw to fight with, and with all his might beſtirreth himſelfe againſt a ſhadow. But the worth of his anſwers is firſt to be ſeene in that which he ſaith to the words of the Apoſtle ; [a] *Bleſſed is bee to whom the Lord imputeth not ſinne. The beſt men ſinne venially*, ſaith he, *and are happy when thoſe their ſinnes be pardoned.* Now the Apoſtle expoundeth *the forgiueneſſe*, or *not imputing of ſinne* there ſpoken of, to bee the *imputation of righteouſneſſe.* But the forgiueneſſe, of their veniall ſinnes, is not the imputation of righteouſneſſe becauſe without any forgiueneſſe of veniall ſinnes, a man continueth righteous and iuſt, as wherein there is no breach of iuſtice and righteouſneſſe, and notwithſtanding the ſame a man is iuſt in the ſight of God, as out of the Romiſh doctrine was ſhewed in the ſection laſt ſauing one. Therefore forgiueneſſe of ſinnes ſpoken of in that place, cannot be vnderſtood of veniall ſinnes. Again, he maintaineth in the queſtion of Satiſfaction, that forgiueneſſe of ſinnes taketh not away the temporall puniſhment of ſinne. How then is a man happie, when thoſe veniall ſinnes be pardoned, if for want of ſatiſfaction he remaine ſtill to pay deare for them, as he ſpeaketh in his Epiſtle, in Purgatory fire?

a Pſalm. 32. 2.

He bringeth in a place of *Cyprian* as idlely as hee did the former texts. To that which he ſaith we anſwer him, that it is by the grace of Chriſt through the forgiueneſſe of ſins, that the wounds which the faithfull man receiueth, be not mortall. His foiles and wounds of themſelues are ſuch, as that he muſt ſay with *Dauid*: [b] *If thou, O Lord, be extreame to remarke iniquities, who can ſtand?* [c] *He ſaw*, ſaith *S. Auſtine, the whole life of man in a manner to be barked at on euery ſide with his ſinne; all conſciences to be accuſed by their owne thoughts;* that

b Pſal. 130. 3.

c *Aug. in Pſal. 129. Vidit propè totâ vitâ humanâ circumlatrari peccatis ſuis, accuſari omnes conſcientias cogitationibus ſuis; non inueniri caſtum cor præſumens de iuſtitia ſua. Si ergo cor caſtum non poteſt inueniri, quod præſumat de ſua iuſtitia, præſumat omnium cor de miſericordia Dei & dicat, ſi &c.*

*that there is not a cleane heart found, that can preſume of it owne righteouſneſſe; If then there cannot be found a cleane heart, which may preſume of it owne righteouſneſſe, let the hearts of all preſume vpon the mercy of God, and ſay, If thou markeſt iniquities, O Lord, who ſhall abide it?* Let Maiſter *Biſhop* marke it well, that in this ware ſare there is no heart cleane that can preſume of it owne righteouſneſſe, and that we haue nothing to reſt vpon, but onely Gods mercy.

To the place of *Hierome*, he ſaith, that *all iuſt men confeſſe themſelues to ſinne venially*. But iuſt men confeſſe their ſinnes in the ſame meaning as they ſay, *Forgiue vs our treſpaſſes*. They ſay, *Forgiue vs our treſpaſſes*, as *S. Auſtine* ſaith the Apoſtles did, as we heard before, for thoſe ſinnes for which they ſay alſo, *Enter not into iudgment with thy ſeruants, for in thy ſight no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified*. They confeſſe therefore ſuch ſinnes as hinder them from being iuſtified in the ſight of God, which *M. Biſhop* ſaith his veniall ſinnes do not. The repeating of the whole ſentence of *Hierome*, is a ſufficient anſwer to him, the latter part whereof he concealeth, becauſe it taketh away his gloſſe vpon the former: [d] *Then are we iuſt when we confeſſe our ſelues to be ſinners, and our righteouſnes ſtandeth not vpon our owne merit, but vpon the mercy of God.* If our righteouſneſſe conſiſt in the acknowledgement of our ſinnes, and in the mercy of God, pardoning and forgiuing the ſame, then is there in vs no ſuch perfection as *M. Biſhop* ſpeaketh of, neither can any worke come from vs, that can haue the title of abſolute and perfect righteouſnes before God. And this will bee yet more manifeſt by that that in the next place is alledged out of Saint *Auſtine*, who noting diuers degrees of charity, ſaith that [e] *the moſt perfect charity no further to be increaſed, is in no man ſo long as he liueth here, and ſo long as it may be increaſed, that that is leſſe then it ought to be, is by reaſon of a corruption or default.* Now heereto Saint *Auſtine* addeth not only that which Maiſter *Biſhop* mentioneth, though hee mention it alſo by halfe; [f] *By reaſon of which* [g] *corruption, there is not a man iuſt vpon earth, which doth good and ſinneth not*, but alſo another ſentence which he concealeth, [h] *By reaſon of which corruption, no man liuing ſhall be iuſtified in the ſight of God.* Now if by reaſon of a corruption remaining in vs, there be ſuch an imperfection of charity, which is the ſubſtãce of inherent iuſtice, as that no mã liuing ſhal be iuſtified in

d Hier cont. Pelag. li. 1. Tunc iuſti ſumus quando nos peccatores fatemur et iuſtitia noſtra nõ ex proprio merito, ſed ex Dei conſiſtit miſericordia.

e Aug. epiſt. 29. 2. Pleniſſima charitas quæ iam augeri non poteſt quãdiu hic homo viuit eſt in nemine. Quamdiu autem augeri poteſt, profectò quisquis id minus eſt quàm debet ex vitio eſt.

f Ex quo vitio non eſt iuſtus, &c.

g Vitij nomen maximè ſo'et eſſe corruptio. Aug. de li. arbit. lib. 3. cap. 19.

h Ex quo vitio non iuſtificabitur, &c.

in Gods ſight, then can no good worke proceed from vs, which can be ſaid to be perfectly and entierly good. For from an vnperfect cauſe, cannot come a perfect effect. [i] *If the roote bee faulty, the branch alſo muſt be ſo.* A lame legge cannot yeeld an vpright and ſtedfaſt gate. Therefore needes muſt there be a lameneſſe and blemiſh in all the good workes that iſſue from vs. For charity is not ſuch as it ought to be, till we *loue the Lord our God with all our ſoule.* But [k] *ſo long as there is any carnall concupiſcence, God is not loued with all the ſoule.* And ſo long as wee liue heere, there is carnall concupiſcence againſt the law of the minde. Therefore ſo long as wee liue here, charity is neuer perfect in vs as it ought to be, neither cã any perfect good worke be effected by vs. *M. Biſhop* minceth and qualifieth the matter, that *no man hath ſo perfect charity, but that ſometimes he doth leſſe then he ought to doe.* But the argument prooueth, that charity is alwaies vnperfect in this life, and therefore not ſometimes onely, but alwaies a man doth leſſe then he ought to do. There is alwaies a blot that ſtaineth our charity, [l] *by reaſon whereof we haue nothing in vs clean, nothing innocent*, as before was cited out of Hilary; and therefore it can yeeld no works that are free from blot and ſtaine. But the Reader is heere to note the conſtancie of this man, who affirmeth here, that *no man hath ſo perfect charity in this life, but that ſometimes he doth leſſe then he ought to doe*, whereas before hee hath told vs of a righteouſneſſe ſo perfect in this life, as that [m] *it faileth not in any duty which we are bound to performe.* Thus giddily hee runneth to and fro, being vncertaine what to ſay, and neuer knowing where hee may ſtand ſure. Now here he ſaith, that the other ſaying of *Auſtine, Woe to the laudable life of man, if it bee examined without mercy*, is ſpoken in reſpect of venial ſinnes, wherein as *Auſtine* vſeth the words in reſpect of hell fire, which they ſay is not incident to their veniall ſinnes. For hauing profeſſed that hee *durſt not ſay, that after baptiſme no word went out of his mothers mouth againſt Gods commaundement, and that Chriſt ſaith, that if a man ſay to his brother, foole, he is guilty of hellfire*, hee addeth theſe words; [n] *And woe euen to the commendable life of man, if thou ſet aſide mercy in the examining (or ſifting) of it.* To which purpoſe hee ſaith alſo in another place; [o] *Whoſoeuer liueth here, howſoeuer iuſtly he liue, woe vnto him, if God enter into iudgement with him.* In which ſort *Arnobius* alſo ſaith, [p] *Woe vnto vs if hee require what wee owe to him;*

*woe*

i *Bern. in Cant ſer. 71. Si radix in vitio & ramus.*

k *Aug. de perfect. iuſtit. Cum eſt aliquid concupiſcentiæ carnalis, &c. non omnimodo ex tota anima diligitur Deus.*

l *Hilar. apud Auguſt. cont. Iulian. li. 2. Supra ſect. 44.*

m Sect. 45.

n *Aug. Confeſſ. lib 9. cap. 13 Væ etiam laudabili vitæ hominum ſi remota miſericordia diſcutias eam.*

o *Idem in Pſal. 42. Quicunque hic viuit quantumlibet iuſtè viuat, væ illi ſi cũ illo in iudicium intrauerit Deus.*

P *Arnob. in Pſal. 135. Væ nobis ſi quod debeamus exegerit; væ nobis ſi quod debet reddiderit.*

*woe vnto vs if he pay what he oweth to vs.* These woes are not vttered in respect of Purgatory or any temporall affliction, but in respect of the issue of that finall dreadfull iudgement, the sentence whereof shall stand for euer. Now if they haue learned by the word of God to denounce this *woe*, then woe to *M. Bishop*, that to the contrary defendeth a righteousnesse so perfect in this life, as that his righteous man [q] *needeth not greatly to feare the rigorous sentence of a iust Iudge*, as who *faileth not in any duty that he is bound to performe*; who can keepe himselfe from all but *veniall sinnes*, which are easily forgiuen [r] *by the Bishops blessing, by holy water, by knocking the breast, by saying a Pater noster, by extreame vnction*, and some other such deuotions madly deuised to that end. As touching the other place of *Austine*, it hath bene already shewed, that our righteousnesse in this life is vnperfect, not onely by comparison, but simply in it self, and according to that that here is required of vs. The imperfections of wit and will, which *M. Bishop* speaketh of, are so great and so many, as that if hee did but with a feeling heart and conscience consider the same, hee would find that there is small cause in the most perfect of this life, to pleade for that perfection that he maintaineth. But beeing a man of a frozen and dead heart, and neither knowing others nor himselfe, by the name of *many light faults* hee passeth ouer those things which make the most righteous and iust to groane vnder the burden of them, and to say with *Dauid*, [s] *Mine iniquities are gone ouer my head, and are like a sore burden, too heauy for mee to beare*: [t] *My sinnes haue taken such hold vpon me, that I am not able to looke vp, they are moe in number then the haires of my head, and my heart hath failed me.* Tush saith *M. Bishop*, what neede all this adoe? all these are but light and veniall faults; but heereby wee conceiue that neither his will nor his wit haue indeede that perfection, that it were fit they should haue. His answer to the words of *Gregory* is ridiculous and childish. *Gregory* forsooth by *our vertue* meaneth the *vertue that wee haue of our owne strength*; when as *Gregorie* teacheth that wee haue no vertue of our owne strength, but onely by the gift of God. [u] *It is called our righteousnesse*, saith he in another place, *not which is ours of our owne, but which by the gift of God becommeth ours.* According to this meaning, hee saith that [x] *the holy man* Iob, *because he saw all the merit of our vertue to be vice if it be strictly iudged by the internall Iudge, did rightly adde, If I will*

q Sect. 4.

r Rhem. Test. im. Annot. Mat. 10. 12. Sext. Prooem. in glossa.

s Psal. 38. 4.

t Psal. 40. 12.

u Greg. Moral. lib. 24. cap. 5. Iustitia nostra dicitur non quæ ex nostro nostra est, sed quæ diuina largitate fit nostra.

x Ibid. li. 9. ca. 1. Sanctus vir quia omne virtutis nostræ meritum vitium esse consuexit, si ab interno arbitro districtè iudicetur, recte subiungit, si vero, &c.

*will contend with him, I shall not bee able to answer him one for a thousand.* He applieth his speech to *Iobs* righteousnesse, which hee had no cause to imagine, that *Iob* alledged as attained vnto by his own strength. And shall we be so mad, as to thinke that if *Iob* had bene perfect by a righteousnesse receiued by the gift of God, hee would say he could not therfore answer God, because he saw all the merit of the vertue that he had by his owne strength to bee but vice? It is strange to see that these men should be so blinde, as not to see the grosse absurdity of these shifts. *Gregory* spake to the instruction of his hearers, whom surely he thought not to be worse then the Pharisee, but knew that they attributed their vertue and righteousnesse to the gift of God; and of that righteousnesse which they confessed to bee Gods good gift, teacheth them to acknowledge, that through our weakenesse and frailty, it becommeth defectiue and faulty, if God call it to precise and strict examination & iudgement. Euen as elsewhere hee saith againe; [y] *All the righteousnesse of man is conuicted to be vnrighteousnesse, if it be strictly iudged: it needeth therefore praier after righteousnesse, that that which being sifted might quaile, by the meere piety of the Iudge may go for good.* Where I hope that *M. Bishop*, though he will say much, yet wil not say, that *Gregory* meant that we should pray, that the righteousnesse which wee doe of our owne strength, by the piety and clemencie of the Iudge may stand for good. And if he dare not so say, then it followeth that of that righteousnesse, which in this life we attaine to by the gift of God, *Gregorie* saith, that it is found to be defectiue, and to come short of perfect righteousnesse, and thereby to be vnrighteousnesse, if seuere and strict account bee taken of it; which more peremptorily he affirmeth elswhere, saying: [z] *If we bee iudged without mercy, our worke is worthy to be punished, which wee expect to haue rewarded. Therefore the teares of expiation*, as he speaketh, *are required, that humble praier may lift vp the merit of our good worke, to the obtaining of eternall reward.* So that howsoeuer hee commend *Iob*, as well he might, sure I am that both *Iob* and he condemne *M. Bishop*, as a proud Pharisee, maintaining the righteousnesse of man against the righteousnesse of God, to the impeaching of the glory of God. Which hee doth also by his quillet of attributing good workes *principally* to the grace of God, not wholy but principally, that so he may reserue some place at least to the *free will* of man, because

y *Ibid. cap. 11. Omnis humana iustitia iniustitia esse conuincatur, si districtè iudicetur. Prece ergo post iustitiam indiget, vt quæ succumbere discussa poterat ipsa iudicis pietate conualescat.*

z *Ibid. ca. 18. Si remota pietate discutimur, opus nostrum pœna digna est. quod remunerari præmijs præstolamur, &c. Restat vt postquã bonum opus agitur lachryme expiationis exquiratur quatenus ad æternæ præmia meritũ recti operis subueha- humilitas postulationis.*

cause hee cannot endure that no part of glory should redound to man. To be short, it appeareth both by that that is said heer, & that that hath bene [a] before alledged, that *Gregory* doth not bereaue mã only of that perfection that shall be in heauen, but also of that that is required, & by duty ought to be in him here vpon the earth.

[a] Sect. 4. 44. 45.

50 W. BISHOP.

*Now before I depart from this large question of iustification, I will handle yet one other question, which commonly ariseth about it:* it is *Whether Faith may be without Charity.*

*I proue that it may so be: first out of these words of our Sauiour:* Many shall say vnto me in that day, *Lord, Lord,* haue we not prophecied in thy name, haue we not cast out diuels, haue wee not done many miracles? to whom I will confesse, that I neuer knew you, depart from me all yee that worke iniquity. *That these men beleeued in Christ, and perswaded themselues assuredly to be of the elect, appeareth by their confident calling of him,* Lord, Lord, *and the rest that followeth: yet Christ declareth manifestly that they wanted charity, in saying that they were workers of iniquity.* Matth. 7.

2. *When the King went to see his guests,* Hee found there a man not attired in his wedding garmẽt, and therefore commanded him to be cast into vtter darknesse. *This man had faith, or else hee had not bene admitted vnto that table which signifieth the Sacraments: yet wãted charity, which to be the wedding garment, besides the euidence of the text is also proued, where in expresse termes,* The garments of Christs Spouse is declared to be the righteousnesse and good works of the Saints. *And that with great reason: for as* S. Paul *teacheth:* Faith shall not remaine after this life: *With what instrument then* (I trow you) *will the Protestants lay hold on Christs righteousnesse?* Matth. 25. Apoc. 19. 1. Cor. 13.

*That charity is that wedding garment,* S. Hierome *vpon the same place doth witnesse saying:* That it is the fulfilling of our Lords commandements. *And* S. Gregory *doth in expresse words define it.* What (*saith he*) must we vnderstand by the wedding garment but charity: *So do* S. Hilary, *and* Origen: *and* S. Chrysostome *vpon that place* Matth. 25. *Hom.* 38. *in Euang. Can* 21. *in Mat. Tract.* 10 *in Matth.*

3. *The like argument is made of the foolish Virgins, who were part of the Kingdome of God, and therefore had faith, which is the gate and entrance into the seruice of God. Yea in the house of God, they aspired vnto more then ordinary perfection, hauing professed Virginitie,*

*yet either caried away with vaine glorie, as* S. Gregory *takes it, or not giuing themselues to the works of mercy, (spirituall and corporall, as* S. Chrysostome *expounds it: briefly not continuing in their former charitie (for faith once had, cannot after the Protestants Doctrine bee lost) were shut out of the kingdome of heauen, albeit they presumed strongly on the assurance of their saluation, as is apparent by their confident demaunding to be let in: for they said,* Lord, Lord open vnto vs.

Iohn.13. 4. Many of the Princes beleeued in Christ, but did not confesse him, for they loued more the glory of men, then the glory of God. *What can be more euident, then that these men had faith? when the holy Ghost saith expresly, that they beleeued in Christ, which is the onely act of faith: and yet were destitute of charity, which preferreth the glorie and seruice of God, before all things in this world.*

## R. Abbot.

That there may be faith without charitie we make no question, but the question is of that faith whereby we are iustified, or wherin standeth our iustification before God. It is to be knowne, that faith is of diuers sorts: there is a faith which is called [a] *the faith of the elect*, as being peculiar vnto them, and for which men are called [b] *faithfull*: and there is a faith by which the [c] *diuels* also are saide to *beleeue*, and yet are not to becalled faithfull. There is a faith whereby we [d] *beleeue that there is one God*: and there is another faith, whereby [e] *we beleeue in God*. There is a faith whereby *Simon Magus* [f] beleeued, whose *heart was not right in the sight of God*, and there is a [g] *faith whereby God purifieth the heart*. There is a [h] *dead faith*, and there is a [i] *faith whereby wee liue, and Christ liueth in vs*. There is a [k] *faith vnfained*, and thereby we vnderstand, that there is also a faigned faith. There is a faith that cõsisteth in [l] *bare assent* of the vnderstanding, and there is a faith that implyeth *the affection of the heart* and will. There is a faith whereby [m] *hee which beleeueth shal neuer perish*: and there is a faith whereby some [n] *beleeue for a time, and in time of temptation go away*. There is a faith which the world [o] *destroyeth*, and there is [p] *a faith which is our victorie, whereby we ouercome the world*. According to these differences, there is [q] *a faith without workes*, and there is [r] *a faith which worketh by loue*. We affirme then of the faith of the elect, whereby we beleeue

a Tit.1.1.
b Ephe.1.1.
c Iam.2.19.
d Ibid.
e Iohn 14.1.
f Act.8.13.21.
g Act.15.9.
h Iam.2.20.
i Gal.2.20.
k 1 Tim.1.5.
l Oecume. in Iac. ca.2. *De simplici assensu fidem dicere solemus, &c. Rursum consecutionem ex affectu precedentem cum firmo assensu nomine fidei vocamus.*
m Iohn 3.15.
n Luke 8.13.
o 2. Tim. 2.18.
p 1. John 5.4.
q Iam.2.14.
r Gal.5.6.

beleeue in God, to which the promise of iustification and eternall life is made, that it is a faith which cannot be separated from charity and good workes, but wheresoeuer it is, there is infallably ioined with it the loue of God, bringing forth [f] *the fruits of righteousnesse, which are by Iesus Christ, to the glory and praise of God.* Now as touching this *faith M. Bishops* arguments must be vnderstood, or else they are nothing against vs; and being so vnderstood, a man would wonder that a wise man should shew so much folly, to bring arguments so impertinent and friuolous, as he hath done. The first is taken from the words of reprobate hypocrites, who [t] *at that day shall say vnto Christ, Lord, Lord, haue we not prophecied in thy name, &c. to whom he shall professe, saying, I neuer knew you, depart from me ye workers of iniquitie.* They shall say, *Lord, Lord*, therefore *they beleeued in Christ, and were perswaded assuredly that they were of the elect*; the conclusion as well agreeing to the antecedent, as a goose feather to a foxes taile. It is to be noted, that faith is grounded vpon the word of God, and the thing which it beleeueth, is that that God hath said. Thus the Apostle telleth vs, that [u] *faith is by hearing, and hearing by the word of God*; and therefore calleth the word of God [x] *the word of faith*, because that is the obiect and matter of faith. Whatsoeuer we conceiue towards God beside the word of God, it is opinion, imagination, presumption, but *faith* it is not. Now the word of God denounceth, that [x] *the soule of the Lord hateth them that loueth iniquitie*; that [y] *all the workers of iniquity shal be destroyed*; that Christ shall say to them at the last day, *Depart from me ye workers of iniquitie.* If then there be no faith but by the word of God, and the word of God denounce destruction to the workers of iniquity, how can it be said that the workers of iniquitie haue faith to perswade themselues assuredly, that they are of the elect? S. *Austine* saith, [z] *He who hath faith without hope and charity, beleeueth that Christ is, but he beleeueth not in Christ.* For [a] *how doth he say that he beleeueth in Christ*, saith Cyprian, *who doth not what Christ hath commanded vs to do?* How then doth *M. Bishop* say, that these *beleeue in Christ*, in whom he confesseth there is no charity, no loue to Christ to do those things which he commandeth? They of whom Christ speaketh, as the words very plainly import, are heretikes, schismatiks, false Apostles, false teachers, yea and such also, as though they preach the truth of Christ, yet preach it not truly & sincere-

[f] Phil 1.11.
[t] Mat. 7.22.
[u] Rom. 10.17.
[x] Ver. 8.
[x] Psal. 11.6.
[y] Psal. 92.9.
[z] *Aug. de verb. Dom. ser. Qui fidem habet sine spe & dilectione Christum esse credit, non in Christum credit.*
[a] *Cyprian. de simplic. prælat. Credere se in Christum quomodo dicit quis non facit quod Christus facere præcepit?*

b Phil.1.15.18. c Cap.2.21. sincerely, but *of enuie and strife, and vnder a pretence*, who vnder the name of Christ *seeke their owne, and not that that is Christs*, making the word of God to serue them, & themselues not seruing it; vsing the Gospel for their purpose, when they haue no true purpose for the Gospel. [a] *taking the testament (of Christ) in their mouthes, but hating to be reformed thereby,* [c] *professing to know God when by their deeds they deny him.* To the name of Christ euen in the mouthes of such wicked men, God somtimes doth that honor, as that miracles are done thereby, diuels are cast out & great effects are wrought, wherein they much glory, & in respect thereof assume much vnto themselues. These in the end, not of faith, but for feare, whē they shal see that which they beleeued not, that [f] *damnation is their end* shall in perplexity of mind cry vnto Christ, whō before they regarded not, and therefore by him now shall be reiected. Of such, though professing to know God, and prophecying in the name of Christ, yet the Apostle saith as the vulgar Latine translateth, and as the word well beareth, that they are [g] *vnbeleeuers*, yea as *Thomas Aquinas* expoundeth it, [h] *not fit to beleeue.* And if they be *vnbeleeuers*, why doth *M. Bishop* say they haue faith? or if they haue faith, why doth the Apostle say that they are vnbeleeuers? Surely they that beleeue destruction to be the end of the works of iniquity, will be carefull to auoid the same. *Cyprian* truly saith: [i] *Our conscience would be afraid if it did beleeue: because it beleeueth not, therefore it feareth not. If it did beleeue, it would take heed, and if it did take heed, it should auoid or escape*, namely the punishments to come, whereof he speaketh in that place. The cause why men [k] *profit not by the word of God*, is *because it is not mingled with faith in those that heare it.* Where there is faith, men profit by it, and it is the [l] *sauour of life vnto life*, but where faith is wanting, it commeth to passe which *Ambrose* saith: [m] *They go from hence to hell, that there they may learne that that is true, which here they would not beleeue.* Thus it commeth to passe with them of whom *M. Bishop* here speaketh, who either preach their owne deuices vnder the name of Christ, or mingle not that with faith in themselues, which they preach to be beleeued of other men. There is not so much as one word in the text whence he should conclude, that euer they were endued with true faith.

f Phil.3.19.

g Tit.1.16. h *Thom. Aquin. in Tit. 1. lect. 4. Non capit ad credendum.* i *Cyprian. de simplic. prælat. Metueret conscientia vestra si crederet; quia non credit omnino nec metuit: si autem crederet & timeret. Si timeret, euaderet.* k Heb.4.2. l 2 Cor.2.16. m *Ambros. in 1. Thessal. 2. Præsentem hanc in gehennam vocat sciant verum esse quod credere noluerunt.*

The next of his arguments is taken from the man that came to the wedding, [n] *not hauing on a wedding garment.* This argument he handleth

n Math.22.11.

handleth verie learnedly. First, he saith, that *this man had faith*; which because hee knewe wee would denie, therefore for proofe thereof, hee addeth, that else *hee had not beene admitted to the table which signifieth the sacraments*. But this needeth as much proof as all the rest, nay it cannot bee proued at all. For men are admitted to the sacraments by men, and they are admitted for profession of faith, when they that admitte them cannot tell whether they haue faith or not. For as *Hilary* saith, [o] *hypocrisie is wont to vse much art to deceiue men & humane simplicity hardly perceiueth the fraud of a dissembling mind*. Many pretend that which is not in them, and make profession of faith with the mouth, when in the heart they haue no faith at all. [p] *Since the name of Christianity hath begun to be in so high regard, the hypocrisie of men hath increased; that is, the dissembling of them who by bearing the name of Christians, regard more to please men then God*. Now sith all these are admitted to the sacraments, & yet [q] *all haue not faith*, it followeth not, that because men are admitted to the sacraments, therefore they haue faith; nay, it is a very ridiculous and childish proofe. Wherefore as it is said, that this man wanted charitie, so we say that he wanted also faith, and so *M. Bishop* is become as wise a man as he was before. Let him then expound the wedding garment to be *charity*, it shall hurt vs nothing. For we will answer him that hee wanted the wedding garment of charity, because he wanted faith: for had he had true faith, he should also haue had loue, because [r] *faith worketh by loue*. But the wedding garment is as well faith as loue. It is indeede Jesus Christ himselfe, of whom the Apostle saith; [s] *Put ye on the Lord Iesus Christ*; and againe, [t] *so many as are baptized into Christ, haue put on Christ*. Him we put on first by faith, thereby making him ours, and applying to our selues the benefitte of his redemption, that appearing before God in the scarlet garment of his obedience to bloudshed & death, we may by forgiueneſſe of sins be accepted for his sake, & thenceforth the residue of our spirituall attire may be put vpō vs, whileſt in putting on Christ, wee [u] *put on the new man, which according to God is created in righteousnes & holinesse of truth*; whileſt we [x] *put on the bowels of mercie, kindneſſe, humbleneſſe of mind, meekeneſſe, long suffering*, whileſt by growing and increasing, wee are still [y] *putting on the brestplate of faith, and loue, and the hope of saluation for an helmet*. Thus *Chrysostome* truely & rightly saith, that [z] *the wedding garment is true faith*,

o *Hilar in Matt. cap. 22. Ita fallendis hominibus plurimum artis solet habere simulatio.* Et paulo post. *Humana simplicitas difficile fraudulentam simulationem intelligit.*

p *Augus. Psal. 7. Postquam in tantum cuiusque homines crevit esse Christianum, crevit hypocrisis; id est, simulatio eorum qui nomine Christiano malunt hominibus placere quàm Deo.*

q 2. *Thes. 3. 2. Tho. Aquis. 3. bud. Licet videantur habere eam, non tamen habent veram.*

r Gal. 5. 6. (Rom. 13. 14.

t Gal. 3. 27.

u Ephes 4. 24.

x Col. 3. 12.

y 1. Thess. 5. 8.

z *Chrysost. Op. imperf. hom 44. Nuptiale vestimentum est fides vera quæ est per Jesum Christum & iustitia eius, &c.*

*which is by Iesus Christ and the righteousnesse thereof*, or *his righteousnesse*. And thus *Ferus* one of *M. Bishops* owne Doctors hath taught vs, that *the wedding garment which is Christ, is put on two maner of waies*: [a] *first inwardly by faith, when vpon our sinnes we put on his righteousnesse: then outwardly when we imitate his loue.* The place which hee alledgeth out of the Reuelation, containeth nothing to the contrarie. [b] *The fine linnen* (wherewith the bride and spouse of Christ is araid) *is* * *the righteousnesses of Saints*; for so is the word in the plurall number. Here is then first [c] *the righteousnes of faith* fully perfect in the bloud of Christ, by the imputation of his obedience and merits; and secondly the righteousnesse of good works & inward conformity vnto God begun in this life, and fully to be perfected at the resurrection of the dead, when Christ shall make his Church [d] *a glorious Church; not hauing spotte or wrinkle, or any such thing, but to be holy and without blame.* But the exception which he maketh, why faith can be no part of this *wedding garment*, is worthy to be noted. Hee hath before told vs, that the wedding supper importeth the Sacraments, the vse whereof is onely in this life; and heere saith, that *faith* cannot bee the wedding garment, because *faith remaineth not after this life. How many mile to London? a poke full of plummes.* But howsoeuer that be, his wisdome might conceiue, that since the last iudgment dependeth respectiuely vpon that that hath beene precedent in this life, therefore as with him the righteousnesse and good workes of the Saints which they haue wrought heere, are their wedding garment for the last daie, so we may also truely say, that the faith whereby in this life we beleeue in Christ, shall be our wedding garment then, when as Saint *Peter* saith, [e] *wee shall receiue the end of our faith, which is the saluation of our soules.* Hee alledgeth *Hierome* for his purpose verie falsly, or at least wise verie vainely. The words of *Hierome* are these: [f] *The wedding garment are the commandements of the Lord, and the workes which are made vp of the law and the Gospell, and do make the garment of the new man.* Why doth he alledge these wordes to exclude faith from being a part of the wedding garment, when as one of the *commandements of the Lord*, as *S. Iohn* telleth vs is this, [g] *that we beleeue in the name of his sonne Iesus Christ*; when as [h] *this is the worke of God*, as our Sauiour saith, that is, a worke that God hath commanded, and wherein hee is pleased, *that wee beleeue in him whom*

a Ferus in Matth. cap. 22. Primo interne per fidem ciu peccatis tuis super iudais Christi iustitiam, &c. Deinde cùm externe charitatem eius æmularis.

b Apoc 19.8.

* τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων.

c Rom. 4.5.11.

d Ephes. 5.27.

e 1. Pet. 1.9.

f Hieron. in Matt. cap. 22. Vestis nuptialis præcepta sunt Domini, & opera quæ complentur ex lege & Euangelio, nouique hominis efficiunt vestimentum.

g 1. Joh. 3.23.

h Joh. 6.29.

*whom he hath ſent* : when as the workes that *are made vp of the law and the Goſpell*, conſiſt not onely in charitie but in faith alſo? I ſtand not vpon the reſt of the teſtimonies which he bringeth: for though any do by occaſion name charity for the wedding garment, as men by diuers occaſions ſpeake diuerſly thereof: yet no man was euer ſo abſurd, as expreſly to exclude true faith from beeing one part of it, as *M. Biſhop* doth. And if any doe ſpeake ſometimes of a faith without charity and fruits of good workes, they ſpeake thereof as wee doe, as beeing onely a baſtard faith, a falſe and fained faith, an idle outward receiuing and profeſſing of the faith, or doctrine of faith: not that true faith which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, to which he aſſigneth our iuſtification in the ſight of God.

The like fooliſh argument he maketh from the [i] *fooliſh virgins*: he may well call it *the like*, becauſe indeede they are all naught. *They had faith*, ſaith he: true, but they had not true faith; they had not that faith which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, wherein our iuſtification is affirmed to conſiſt. For of that faith the Proteſtants ſay truly, that it cannot bee loſt, becauſe God hath made vnto it the promiſe of eternall life, and therefore Chriſt praieth for it, that it may neuer faile. They had a forme or ſhew of faith, as they had [k] *a forme or ſhew of godlineſſe*, but neuer knew *the power thereof*. His tale of *perfection* is an idle dreame, as we ſhall ſee hereafter, if God will. As for them that apply this text to the profeſſion of virginitie, they do apparent wrong therin, the verie text it ſelfe giuing to vnderſtand, that therby is deſcribed *the kingdome of heauen*, by which in theſe parables euerie where is vnderſtood the whole ſtate of the outward and militant Church profeſſing to ſeeke the kingdome of heauen. To take it otherwiſe is to offer violence to a verie plaine and manifeſt text. Vnder the name of *Virgins* all are comprehended, who by profeſſion and promiſe of faith and baptiſm, haue vndertaken to be [l] *virgins*, that is, entire and faithfull vnto Chriſt. By the *lampe* is imported that outward profeſſion to men: the *oile* ſignifieth true faith and a good conſcience inwardly to God. Howſoeuer the lampes of fooliſh virgins, of idle and emptie profeſſors giue them credite with men, ſo as that they are not barred from the companie and conuerſation of the wiſe, yet in the ſleepe of death they ſhall goe out, and ſhall not ſerue to light them to go to God: then ſhall they too late ſeeke and wiſh for that, the opportunity whereof before they

i Matt. 25. 1.

k 2. Tim. 3.

l 1. Cor. 11.

they careleſly omitted. Then ſhall they crie, *Lord, Lord*, as the other did before, but it ſhall not boot them to cry when the doores ſhall be ſhut againſt them. Thus doth Chriſt giue the ſame to vnderſtād of hypocrites in generall, which before he had done of hypocriticall & falſe teachers: and what he ſaith here, he expreſſeth more fully by the other Euangeliſt, that when they ſhall cry, [m] *Lord, Lord, open to vs*, & Chriſt ſhall anſwer vnto them, *I know you not whence you are: then they ſhall begin to ſay; We haue eaten & drunk in thy preſence, & thou haſt taught in our ſtreets.* Where we ſee them pleading that they haue heard Chriſt preach, and they haue beene partakers of his Sacraments, but they cannot plead for themſelues, that they beleeued in him: therefore he ſhall anſwer them againe: *I tell you, I know ye not whence ye are, depart from me ye workers of iniquity.*

m Luk.13.25.

His fourth argument is of [n] *many amongſt the chiefe rulers of the Iewes, who beleeued in Chriſt, but yet confeſſed him not, becauſe of the Phariſees, leſt they ſhould bee caſt out of the ſynagogue: for they loued the praiſe of men, more then the praiſe of God.* Here we ſee, faith indeed as he ſaith, but we ſee no neceſſity that faith ſhould be vnderſtood here to be without charity. Here is weake faith & weake loue, too much yet entangled & tied in the nets of carnall & earthly reſpects, but he hath no ground to affirme that there is no loue. Yes, ſaith he, *for charity preferrs the glory & ſeruice of God before all things in the world*, whereas theſe men were afraid to confeſſe Chriſt. Indeede [o] *perfect charity caſteth out all feare*, and perfect faith breedeth perfect charitie: but there is a beginning of true faith & loue, which beeing yet little & weake, and hauing not yet ouermaſtered all worldly regards, is for a time timorous and fearefull to confeſſe Chriſt, yet groweth to ſtrength by little and little, till it reſolue to cleaue vnto him with loſſe of all other things. Such was the faith of *Nicodemus* & *Ioſeph* of Arimathea, who were two of theſe chiefe rulers, the one [p] *cōming to Ieſus by night*, the other *a diſciple alſo*, [q] *but ſecretly for feare of the Iewes*, who yet afterwards beeing ſtirred vp with thoſe things which they beheld & ſaw in the death of Chriſt, more boldly ſhewed themſelues in his behalfe, and in the end forſooke all for the following of his ſeruice. In the meane time they ſhewed loue alſo to Chriſt, though weakly, [r] the one in ſpeaking in his behalfe, [s] the other in withholding his *conſent from the counſell and deed* that was acted againſt Chriſt; both in yeelding themſelues

n Ioh.12.42.

o 1.Ioh.4.18.

p Ioh.3.2.
q Cap.19.38.

r Cap.7.50.51.
s Luk.23.51.

to

to be his disciples, and to be instructed by him. Such was the faith and loue of the Apostles themselues, who were euery while affrighted, and in his greatest distresse [t] *all forsooke him and fled.* But he that [u] *breaketh not the brused reed, nor quencheth the smoaking flaxe, till he bring forth iudgment into victorie,* where soeuer he seeth true faith, and vnfained loue, though yet weake and feeble, watereth and cherisheth, and vndersetteth the same, that it may grow to strength. [x] *The Euangelist* (saith S. *Austin*) *noteth and reprooueth some, of whom notwithstanding he saith, that they did beleeue in Christ, who if they did grow forward in this beginning of faith, wold by growing forward ouercome the loue of humane glory, which the Apostle had ouercome, who saith God for bid, that I should reioyce but in the crosse of our Lord Iesus Christ.* This growth there is where soeuer there is true and vnfained faith, and because it cannot grow without loue, it groweth to the ouercoming of all contrarie loue, til it cleaue wholy vnto God. Thus the Gospel expresly teacheth concerning some of these chief rulers, and we cannot doubt, but that the like befell in the rest of them that did truly beleeue in Christ. They beleeued, but their faith was weake, and their loue was according to their faith: til increase of faith brought further strength of loue, and they learned by faith & loue to prefere the seruice of Christ before all the glory of this world. Albeit, it is not to be omitted, that *S. Iohn* sometime following the Hebrew phrase, vseth the terme of *beleeuing in Christ* abusiuely, applying it to them who by the miracles of Christ, and his manifest declaration of the truth, were conuicted in conscience to acknowledge him to be of God, but yet did not at all in their hearts submit themselues vnto him. Thus he saith in another place; that [y] *many beleeued in the name of Christ when they saw his miracles which he did, to whom yet he did not commit himselfe because he knew what was in them.* Thus might it be said of some of those chiefe rulers, that *they beleeued in Christ*, that is, were perswaded in their minds that he spake the truth, but yet preferring their credit & reputatiō with men, gaue no regard vnto it. But that there is an other manner of beleeuing *in Christ*, which is that wherof we speake, not incident to them who cōtinue wholy possessed with such respects, Christ himself sheweth, saying: [z] *How can ye beleeue which receiue honor one of another, & seek not the honor that cometh of God alone?* They might therfore in some meaning be said to beleeue in Christ, when yet

[t] Mat. 26. 56.

[u] Cap. 12. 20.

[x] *Aug. in Ioan. tract. 53. Vide a quemadmodum Euangelista noluerit & improbauerit quosdam, quos tamen in eum credidisse dixit, qui in hoc ingressu fidei si profecerint amorem quoque humanæ gloriæ proficiendo superarent.*

[y] Ioh. 2. 23.

[z] Ioh. 5. 44.

yet they had no true faith, which as appeareth by these words, cannot be separated from loue, and seeking of the honor that cõmeth of God alone: which whersoeuer it is begun, beginneth to looke vnto God, and winding by degrees out of all other regards, yeeldeth it selfe intirely to follow him. Therefore the distinctiõ of faith being obserued, which the Scripture it selfe enforceth vpon vs, *M. Bishop* hath yet alledged nothing to proue, that true faith and charitie may be diuided, or that any man may be said truly to beleeue in whom there is not also loue to righteousnesse and good works.

## 51. W. Bishop.

Cap. 2. 5 *This place of* S. Iames, (What shall it profit my brethren, if any man say that he hath faith, but hath not works: *what* shall his faith be able to saue?) *supposeth very plainly, that a man may haue faith without good workes, that is, without charitie, but that it shall auaile him nothing*: Caluin *saith, that the Apostle speaketh of a shadow of faith which is a bare knowledge of the articles of our Creed, but not a iustifying faith Without doubt he was litle acquainted with that kind of faith by which Protestants be iustified, but he directly speakes of such a faith, as* Abraham *was iustified by saying,* That that faith did worke with his works, & was made perfect by the works *Was this but a shadow of faith? But they reply, that this faith is likened vnto the faith of the Diuell, and therefore cannot be a iustifying faith: that followeth not: for an excellent good thing, may be like vnto a bad in some things, as Diuels in nature are not onely like, but the very same as Angels be: euen so a full Christian faith may be well likened vnto a Diuels faith, when it is naked and voyd of good works, in two points: first, in both there is a perfect knowledge of all things reuealed: secondly, this knowledge shall not stead them any whit, but only serue vnto their greater condemnation, because that knowing the wil of their maister, they did it not. And in this respect* S. Iames *compareth them together: now there are many points wherein these faiths do differ, but this one is principal: that Christians out of a godly and deuout affection, do willingly submit their vnderstanding vnto the rules of faith, beleeuing things aboue humain reason, yea such as seeme sometimes contrary to it But the diuel against his will, beleeues all that God hath reuealed, because by his natural capacitie he knowes that God cannot teach, nor testifie, any vntruth. Againe that faith may be without charitie, is proued out of these words of the same*

*same 2. chapter.* Euen as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead. *Hence thus I argue: albeit the body be dead without the soul, yet it is a true natural body in it selfe: euen so faith is perfect in the kind of faith, although without charity it auail not to life euerlasting. Lastly, in true reason it is manifest, that faith may be without charity, for they haue seuerall seates in the soule, one being in the will, and the other in the vnderstanding: they haue distinct obiects, faith respecting the truth of God, and charity the goodnesse of God. Neither doth faith necessarily suppose charity, as charity doth faith, for we cannot loue him of whom we neuer heard. Neither yet doth charity naturally flow out of faith, but by due consideration of the goodnesse of God, and of his benefits and loue towards vs, into which good and deuout considerations few men do enter, in comparison of them who are led into the broad way of iniquity through their inordinate passions. This according to the truth: and yet more different in the Protestants opinion: for faith layes hold on Christs righteousnes, & receiues: that in: but charity can receiue nothing in, as* M. Perkins *witnesseth, but gines it selfe forth in all duties of the 1. and 2. Table. Now sir, if they could not apply vnto themselues Christs righteousnes without fulfilling all duties of the 1. and 2. Table, they should neuer apply it to them: for they hold it impossible to fulfill all those duties: so that this necessary linking of charity with faith, maketh their saluation not only very euill assured: but altogether impossible: for charity is the fulnesse of the law, which they hold impossible, and then if the assurance of their saluation, must needs be ioyned with such an impossibility, they may assure themselues, that by that faith they can neuer come to saluation.* Pag. 85. Rom. 13.

R. Abbot.

That faith may be without charity and good workes, it is true, and we doubt not thereof, according to the meaning of faith of which *S. Iames* speaketh, which *Caluin* very iustly and rightly saith, *is but a shadow of faith.* For it plainely appeareth by the text, that hee speaketh of faith, as onely professed before men, as before hath bin alledged. Therefore he compareth it [a] to the good words of him, that wisheth wel to the poore man, but doth nothing at all for him. To this tendeth his question, [b] *What auaileth it though a man say that he hath faith?* and this other demand, [c] *shew me thy faith?* The vttermost that he extendeth it to by instance, is a meer historicall faith: [d] *Thou beleeuest that there is one God.* His purpose is to shew, that

a Iam. 2. 16. b Ver. 14. c Ver. 18. d Ver. 19.

faith

faith if it be truly profeſſed hath a root within, from whence ſpring by obedience the fruits of al good workes, and if it giue not foorth it ſelfe by workes, it is no true faith. Whereas *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *S. Iames ſpeaketh directly of ſuch a faith as Abraham was iuſtified by*, he ſaith very vntruly and abſurdly: for *S. Iames* bringeth the example of the true, and liuely, and workfull faith of *Abraham*, as oppoſite to that idle and dead faith, concerning which hee propounded that queſtion of faith and workes. Yea of *Abrahams* faith hee

[a] Ver. 23. ſheweth that it was ſaid,[a] *Abraham beleeued God and it was counted vnto him for righteouſneſſe*, which was neuer ſaid of any man for *ſaying that he had faith, for beleeuing that there is one God*, for that faith that conſiſteth onely in profeſſion before men. Now the faith

[f] ver. 22. of *Abraham* which[f] *wrought with his workes, and was made perfect by his workes*,

[g] *Beda. in Epiſt. Iac. cap. 2.* [g] that is, ſaith *Beda*, *was proued by the performance of workes to be perfect in his heart*, this faith of *Abraham*, I ſay, is it whereby the Proteſtants hope to be iuſtified in the ſight of God, as

[h] Rom. 4. 23. *Abraham* was, becauſe[h] *it was not written for him onely, that it was imputed to him for righteouſneſſe but alſo for vs, to whom it ſhall be imputed, beleeuing in him that raiſed vp Ieſus our Lord from the dead.* We alledge further, that the faith whereof *S. Iames* ſpeaketh, is likened to the faith of diuels, and therfore that it cannot be the ſame with that which the Scripture nameth for a iuſtifying faith. *M. Biſhop* anſwereth, that *that followeth not*, and for auouching thereof, maketh *Abrahams* faith not onely the ſame with the faith of hypocrites & falſe Chriſtians, but alſo with the faith of diuels. He would qualifie the matter in ſhew, but in truth maketh no difference. *An excellent good thing may be like vnto a bad in ſome thing*, ſaith he. True, but yet the bad cannot be like the good in that wherin ſtandeth the goodneſſe and excellency of the good Now hee maketh the Hypocrites faith, if we conſider the very act of faith, the ſame that *Abrahams* faith was, which was reputed vnto him for righteouſneſſe, and for which the Scripture ſetteth him forth as an excellent patterne of faith to be followed of all beleeuers. But to auoide the odiouſneſſe hereof, he ſophiſticateth the matter, and ſo much as in him lyeth, blindeth his Reader. *They are like* (ſaith he) *in two points*: where in the firſt point, he comprehendeth the fulnes and perfection of that which he calleth Catholike and Chriſtian faith, conſiſting (as here abſurdly he ſaith) *in the perfect knowledge of all things reuealed*, as if

euery

euery one that hath their Catholike faith, haue *the perfect knowledg of all things reuealed*, but as more plainly he hath deliuered his mind before [i] *in beleeuing all to be true that God hath reuealed.* No more is there in *Abrahams* faith, if we keep within the compaſſe of the nature of faith, & no leſſe in the diuell, & the ſame in euery Catholike Chriſtian, and ſo the diuel is become a Catholike whether he wil or not. Come on *M. Biſhop*, rid vs of this doubt, for we cannot find by you, but that the diuell by Catholike faith is become a Catholike. He goeth on: *Secondly this knowledge ſhal not ſteed them any whit.* But that is nothing to the very nature of faith, whether it ſteede or not ſteede. The eſſence & act of faith whether it ſteed or not ſteed, is no more but this, *to beleeue generally all to be true, which God hath reuealed*, and therfore whether with good works or without, the faith of the Catholike Chriſtian in the act of faith, is no other but the diuels faith. Now albeit he ſay, that *theſe faiths differ in many points*, yet of thoſe many he nameth but onely one, and that nothing to the purpoſe. For if he will ſhew a difference of faith betwixt Chriſtians and diuels, he muſt take it from faith it ſelfe, and not from thoſe things which to the nature of faith are meerely accidental. *Chriſtians*, ſaith he, *out of a godly and deuout affection, do willingly ſubmit their vnderſtanding to the rules of faith.* But this is not to make a difference, but to adde charity vnto faith. This *godly and deuout affection, and willing ſubmiſſion*, is an act of charity, and not of faith: an act of the wil and affection wherein charity is ſeated, not of the vnderſtanding, wherin he ſaith is the ſeat of faith. And in this affection and ſubmiſſion, faith it ſelfe ſtill is no more then it was before, to beleeue all to be true that God hath reuealed. The diuel then ſtill pleadeth for himſelfe, that if the Catholike faith which *M. Biſhop* hath deſcribed; do make a Catholike, there is no reaſon to except againſt him for being a Catholike, becauſe he beleeueth all to bee true which God hath reuealed. Or if he wil ſay that true Chriſtian faith doth alwaies actually & neceſſarily imply this *godly & deuout affection and willing ſubmiſſion of the vnderſtanding to the rules of faith*, then becauſe this cannot be without charity, let him grant the queſtion, let vs trauell no further about this point, but let him ſay as wee ſay, that the true Chriſtiã faith wherby it is ſaid we are iuſtified, cã neuer be ſeparate frõ charity & good works. Thus he caſteth himſelf into he knoweth not what Labyrinths & mazes, & cannot tel how to get out. How much

[i] *Sect.* 18.

much better were it for him to acknowledge the simple and plaine truth of God, then to intricate himselfe in these perplexities, wherin he can find no place to stand secure. But yet out of the words of *S. Iames*, *As the body without the sprit is dead, so faith without works is dead*, hee will further proue, that faith may be without charitie, and yet *perfect in the kind of faith*. Now this is it that hath bin said, that *in the kind of faith*, considering faith entirely in it selfe, he maketh *Abrahams* faith and the diuels faith to be all one. As touching the words of *S. Iames* sufficient hath beene said before. If faith bee considered as outwardly professed to men, as he intendeth it, good workes are the life of faith. If it be considered as it is inward in the heart to God, good works cannot be the life thereof, because that which is without cannot giue life to that that is within. Whereas he turneth *works into charity*, he playeth the Sophister: for it is one thing to talke of charity, another thing to talke of workes; the one being in habite, the other in act; the one inward, the other outward; the one the tree, the other the fruit; the one the spring, the other the streame. But letting this passe as handled before, let vs see how he argueth from the place of *Iames*: *Albeit the body bee dead without the soule, yet is it a true naturall body in it selfe*. But that is not true, for a true naturall body is that onely, which hath the true members and parts of a naturall body, which a dead bodie hath not. [k] *When the body is dead*, saith *Aristotle*, *there shall bee neither foote nor hand, but onely by semblance of name, as a man tearmeth a hand of stone; for in like sort is a dead hand: for all parts of the body are defined by their office and faculty. Therefore when they lye dead they are not the same, but retaine onely the shew and shadow of the name*. The argument therefore must be turned against himselfe, that as the dead body is not a true naturall body, but onely by equiuocation is so called: euen so a dead faith, is no true faith, but onely by equiuocation for some semblance to men it carrieth the shew and shadow of the name of faith. Yet hee will not so giue ouer, but as hauing set the stocke vpon it, hee will winne it in this period, or else he will loose all. Indeede hee is like a sheepe tangled in the briars, the more he strugleth and striueth, the faster he tyeth himself. He saith, that faith & charity haue *seuerall seates in the soul, faith in the understanding, and charity in the will*. But that is not so: for as hath beene before said, true and vnfained faith which the

k *Arist. Polit. lib. 1. cap. 1.*

Scrip-

Scripture commendeth, for iuſtification is a mixt action of the vnderſtanding and will. Yea the Apoſtle expreſly placeth faith in the heart, which is the ſeat of the affections. [l] *With the heart* (ſaith hee) *man beleeueth vnto righteouſneſſe: If thou confeſſe with thy mouth the Lord Ieſus, and beleeue in thy heart that God raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt bee ſaued.* No maruell that *M. Biſhop* cannot tell what true faith is, who knoweth no other faith but onely a faith of the head, conſiſting in ſpeculatiue fancies and imaginations of the braines, and deſcending no lower then the tongue: whereas the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of a faith of the heart, a feeling faith, which by feeling gathereth to it the affection and will; which is not onely an act of knowledge and vnderſtanding, as *M. Biſhop* dreameth, but implieth an affecting, deſiring, embracing, ſeeking of that which it beleeueth, a ioying and reuiewing of it ſelfe therein. So I alledged before out of *Oecumenius*, that the faith whereof Saint *Paul* ſpeaketh is not a bare aſſent, as is the faith of diuels and *M. Biſhops* Catholike faith, but [m] *hath ſome further conſequence ariſing from the affection.* Againe they haue *diſtinct obiects*, ſaith he, *faith reſpecting the truth of God, and charity the goodneſſe of God.* Indeed the *truth of God* is the obiect of our faith; but what is the matter of that truth, but the promiſe of God concerning his goodneſſe towards vs? [n] *I ſhould vtterly haue fainted* (ſaith *Dauid*) *but that I beleeue verily to ſee the goodneſſe of the Lord in the land of the liuing.* [o] *The faith* (ſaith *Ferus*) *which the Scripture cõmendeth, is nothing els but to truſt to the free mercie of God.* So then the goodnes and mercy of God is properly and truly the obiect of our faith. Yea and how ſhould the goodneſſe of God be the obiect of our charitie, but by being firſt the obiect of our faith? For therefore do wee loue the goodneſſe of God, or loue of God for his goodneſſe towards vs, becauſe firſt we beleeue the ſame, neither can wee ſo loue but by beleeuing. For charity conſiſting ſimply in affection, apprehendeth nothing in God of it ſelfe, but receiueth all from faith, which is it as *Chryſoſtome* noteth, [p] *whereby we conceiue a due and conuenient opinion concerning God.* Loue is not a reciprocall action; the paſſage thereof is meerely from him that loueth to the thing that is loued. Thus therefore it is in our loue to God, but what we conceiue backe againe of him towards vs, it is by faith and not by loue. Yea *M. Biſhop* himſelfe verifieth this, in that hee ſaith, *Wee cannot*

[l] Rom. 10. 10.

[m] *Oecumen. in Jac. cap. 2. Conſecutionem ex affectu procedentē.*

[n] Pſal. 27. 13.

[o] *Ferus in Mat. ca. 8. Fides quam Scriptura commendat nihil aliud eſt quam fidere gratuitæ Dei miſericordiæ.*

[p] *Chryſo. in Rom. hom. 8 Conuenientem de deo opinionem accipit.*

*loue him, of whom wee neuer heard.* For what is all our hearing, but onely by beleeuing that which we heare? First therefore wee heare of Gods goodneſſe, his mercy, his truth, &c. and by beleeuing that which we heare, our affections are drawne vnto him. First therfore all theſe are the obiects of our faith, and conſequently become the obiects of our loue. His next difference is a meere begging of the queſtion. We ſay, that *faith* though it do not preſuppoſe charity as a thing precedent, yet alwaies ſuppoſeth and inferreth it as an immediate and neceſſary conſequent. For faith receiueth Chriſt ¶ *to dwell in our hearts*, who commeth not but accompanied with grace and with the fruits of the ſpirit, which alwaies grow and increaſe according to the increaſe and growth of faith. Great faith hath feruent loue, weaker faith hath weaker loue, but alwaies hath a meaſure of loue anſwerable to it ſelfe. Now by this that hath bene ſaid it appeareth how vntruly *M. Biſhop* ſaith for his laſt difference, that *charity doth not naturally flow out of faith*, whereas indeed common ſenſe in diuinity doth inſtruct him, that the original therof is from thence and onely from thence. For if we cannot loue God but by hearing & beleeuing him to be that that he is, then it is faith which ſetting God before vs ſuch a one as he is, wiſe, mighty, iuſt, merciful, louing and gracious vnto vs, enamoreth our hearts, and breedeth in vs affections correſpondent to his grace, neither is there any ſpark of loue but what ariſeth from this ground. Yea *M. Biſhop* himſelfe confeſſeth ſo much, but that his wits are ſo beſotted with his minion of Rome, that he knoweth not what hee ſaith. *Charitie* (ſaith he) *doth not naturally flow out of faith, but by due conſideration of the goodnes of God, and of his benefits and loue towards vs.* Which is as much as if he ſhould ſay, it doth not naturally flow out of faith, but doth naturally flow out of faith. For whence is this *conſideration of Gods goodnes, &c.* but from faith? Do we conſider theſe things any otherwiſe but as by faith we firſt apprehend and beleeue the ſame? It is faith (as hath bene ſaid) which affecteth and ſeaſoneth the hart with the ſweet taſt and feeling of thoſe conſiderations, and thereby allureth and draweth vs to loue him of whom we haue receiued ſo great loue. And for want of faith it is that it cometh to paſſe which *M. Biſhop* to make vp his ſentence impertinently complaineth of, that few men enter into theſe good and deuout conſiderations; yea he and his by oppugning and deſtroying true faith, do helpe

¶ Eph. 3. 17.

to

to draw men backe from conſidering of theſe things. Now all that hitherto he hath ſaid, he telleth vs is according *to the truth*, whereas indeede there is not a word true, as hath appeared: and if it had beene true, yet he had gained nothing thereby, becauſe it followeth not, that thoſe things which are diuided in facultie and vſe, are therefore deuided in the ſubiect, or may be the one without the company of the other, as by infinite examples may be ſeene. But hee maketh *faith and charity more different yet in the Proteſtants opinion*. And how? *For faith* (ſaith hee) *layeth hold of Chriſts right eouſnes, and receiues that in; but charity receiueth nothing in, but giueth it ſelfe forth in all duties of the firſt and ſecond table.* But what of this? Will hee conclude thus, There is a difference betwixt faith and charity, therefore faith may be without charity? No forſooth: but vnleſſe faith may be without charitie, the Proteſtants ſaluation is vnpoſſible. And why ſo? Marrie charity is the fulneſſe of the law, and the Proteſtants hold it vnpoſſible to fulfill the law, therefore they can haue no charity; and therefore by their owne doctrine they can haue no faith, becauſe without charity there is no faith. What a horrible diſputer *M. Biſhop* is? how deepe a reach hath hee into hell, that hee can fetch from thence theſe profound concluſions againſt the Proteſtants? The Proteſtants anſwer to his ridiculous and childiſh collections, is eaſie and ready. True and liuely faith, by the conſideration of the goodneſſe and mercy of God towards vs in Ieſus Chriſt, enkindleth in our hearts true charity and loue towards God, and towards our brethren and neighbours for Gods ſake. The ayme and marke of which charity, is to giue forth it ſelfe in all duties of the firſt and ſecond table. But charity ſo long as here wee liue is vnperfect in all men, and but perfectly attaineth to that that it aymeth at. Some attaine in ſome good ſort to the performance of ſome duties, others to the performance of ſome other duties, but none attaineth to all, as [r] *Hierome* well noteth againſt the Pelagian heretickes: yea and in thoſe that wee do attaine vnto, there is alſo ſome weakeneſſe and default, ſome blot and ſtaine, as hath bene ſhewed by the corruption of ſinne [ſ] *that hangeth ſo faſt on*, and *preſſeth vs downe* whileſt wee are labouring and ſtriuing to aſcend vpward vnto God. Thus therefore faith and charity go together, weake faith, and charity vnperfect

[r] *Hieron. aduer. Pelag. lib. 1. Nullus in iſto corpuſculo cunctas poteſt habere virtutes, &c.*

[ſ] Heb. 12. 1.

perfect, running in the way, but oftentimes through frailtie ſtumbling and falling; ſtriuing to the keeping of all Gods commandements, but yet forced to ſay with the Apoſtle, [t] *The good that I wold, I do not, but the euill that I would not that I do: I delight in the law of God as touching the inner man, but I ſee another law in my members rebelling againſt the law of my mind, and leading me captiue to the law of ſinne.* But faith is our comfort, that God for Chriſts ſake, and for his righteouſnes ſake which he hath wrought for our redemption, accepteth vs as perfectly righteous in him, that he forgiueth all our ſins winketh at all our imperfections, and will heale all our wounds and infirmities, that what is now impoſſible through the weakneſ of the fleſh, may be made expedite and ready vnto vs, when there ſhall be no longer the *fleſh luſting againſt the ſpirit*, but ſin & death and all enemies ſhall be deſtroied, and [u] *God ſhall be all in all.* Thus the linking of faith and charity maketh no impoſſibility of our ſalnation, but it is the ſpirit of error that hath dazeled *M. Biſhops* eyes, that he cannot diſcerne how one truth agreeth and ſtandeth with another.

[t] Rom. 7. 19.

[u] 1. Cor. 15. 28.

## 52 W. BISHOP.

*Let vs annex vnto theſe plain authorities of holy Scripture, one euident teſtimony of antiquity: that moſt incorrupt iudge S.* Auguſtine *ſaith flatly*, that faith may wel be without charity, but it cānot profit vs without charity. *And*, That one God is worſhipped ſometimes out of the Church, *but that vnskilfully, yet is it he. Alſo that one faith is had without charitie, and that alſo out of the Church neither therefore is not faith. For there is one God, one Faith, one Baptiſme, and one immaculate Catholike Church: in which God is not ſerued onely, but in which onely he is truly ſerued: neither in which alone faith is kept, but in which onely faith is kept with charity. So that faith, and that only true faith, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh*, One God, one faith, *may be, and is in many without charitie.*

Lib. 15. de Trin. ca. 17. cont. Creſc. lib. 1. cap. 29.

Epheſ. 4.

## R. ABBOT.

The former of theſe two places which hee citeth out of *Auſtin*, is anſwered [a] before. The faith of which he ſpeaketh, is not the true iuſtifying faith, but onely the outward profeſſion of the doctrine

[a] Sect. 22.

doctrine of faith. That is plaine by the second. b *One faith is had without charitie, euen without the Church, that is, one doctrine of faith:* euen as the Apostle meaneth, when he saith, *One faith, one baptisme, &c.* Thus Saint *Austin* declareth it, when he calleth it *the faith whereby it is beleeued that Christ is the Sonne of the liuing God: the faith whereby we confesse Christ to be the Sonne of the liuing God:* and in other meaning he could not say, there is but one faith, because of the faith of particular consciences the Scripture saith, that euery man shall d *liue by his owne faith.* That that he maketh the matter of faith, the diuels acknowledg and confesse, who yet cannot truly say, *I beleeue in God, I beleeue in Iesus Christ,* which is the voice and profession of true iustifying faith, and cannot be separated from hope and charitie, as hath beene before made manifest by the acknowledgment of *Austin* himselfe: yea and the doctrine of faith, though in generall termes it may be sometimes found amongst heretikes, yet according to the substance and true meaning thereof, is not to be found with them, as the same Saint *Austin* acknowledgeth, saying, e *If diligently be seeking, be considered which belong to Christ, Christ is found, as touching his name, amongst all sorts of heretikes, who will needs be called Christians, but indeed he is not with them.* So as then there may be the true faith of Christ in generall words, where the true meaning of the faith of Christ is denied, and there may be the true meaning of the faith of Christ in the profession of the mouth, when the same faith is not truly and effectually imprinted in the heart. And in this sort there may be indeed faith without charitie, but not the iustifying faith, as hath bin often said. If there be that faith concerning which it is said of *Abraham, f He beleeued the Lord, and it was imputed to him for righteousnesse:* there followeth alwayes charitie as a necessary and infallible consequent and companion thereof.

b *Augustin. cont. Crescon. lib. 1 cap. 29.*

c *Ibid. cap. 28. Fides qua creditur Christum esse filium dei viui. & cap 29. Fides qua confitemur Christum esse filium Dei viui.*

d *Habac. 2. 4.*

e *August. Enchirid. cap. 5 Si diligenter quæ ad Christum pertinent cogitetur, nominet suus inuenitur Christus apud quoslibet hæreticos, qui se Christianos vocari volunt, re verò ipsa non est apud eos.*

f *Gen. 15. 6.*

## W. Bishop.

*The Protestants bold asseuerations, that they cannot be parted, are great, but their proofes very slender, and scarce worth the disprouing.*

*The first,* He that hath not care of his owne, hath denied his faith: i. Tim. 5. therefore saith he, includeth that good worke of building for our

Answer. That faith here sometimes signifie not that faith whereby we beleeue all things reuealed, or the Preests are certainly of their saluation: but for fidelitie, and faithfull performance of that which we haue promised in baptisme, which is to keepe all Gods commandements: one of the which, is to prouide for our children, and for them that we haue charge of: so that he who hath no such care ouer his owne charge, hath denied his faith, that is violated his promise in Baptisme. There is also another ordinary answer, supposing faith to be taken there for the Christian beleefe, to wit, that one may deny his faith two wayes: either in flat denying any article of faith, or by doing some thing that is contrarie to the doctrine of our faith. Now he that hath no care of his owne, doth not deny any article of his faith, but committeth a fact contrary to the doctrine of his faith: for that is not faith, but the doctrine of faith, or our promise in Baptisme, includeth good workes.

Iohn. 2 There are among you that beleeue not: for he knew who beleeued, and who was to betray him: *Opposing treason to faith, as if he had said: faith containeth in it selfe fidelitie. This argument is farre fetched, and little worth. For although faith hath not fidelity and loue alwaies necessarily ioyned with it, yet falling from faith, may worke an after it hatred and treason, yea ordinarily wickednesse goeth before falling from the faith, and is the cause of it: which was Iudas case, whom our Saviour there taxed, for he blinded with couetousnesse, did not beleeue Christs doctrine of the blessed sacrament; and by incredulitie opened vnto himself a high way to his heart, to negotiate treason in it.*

1 Iohn 2. 3 *The obiect that*: Who saith he knowes God, and doth not keep his commandements, is a lyer.

Answer. *He is then a liar in graine, who professeth the onely true knowledge of God, yet blusheth not to say, that it is impossible to keepe his commandements: but to the obiection, knowing God in that place, is taken for louing of God, as*: I know ye not: that is, I loue you not. *Our Lord knowes the way of the iust, that is, approues it, loues it: so he*

Matth. 7. & 25. Psal. 1. Ioh. 14. *that knowes God, keepes his commandements, as Christ himselfe testifieth*: If anie loue me, he will keepe my word. And he that loueth me not, will not keepe my words.

*Lastly, they say with* S. Paul: That the iust man liueth by faith. *But if faith giue life, then it cannot be without charitie.*

Answer. *That faith in a iust man is not without hope and charity, by al which conioyned he liueth, & not by faith alone. But faith is in a iustful*

and

*and vniuſt man, without charity: who holding faſt his former beleefe, doth in tranſgreſſing Gods commandements, breake the bands of charity. And ſo it remaineth moſt certaine, that faith may be and too too often is without the ſacred ſociety of charity.*

R. ABBOT.

The Proteſtants aſſeuerations are indeed very bold, but not vpon ſlender proofes. Their proofes are ſtronger then that any ſuch filly diſputers as *M. Biſhop* is, ſhall be able to diſproue them. As for his proofes to the contrarie, thou haſt ſeene gende Reader, how miſerable, and poore, and beggerly they bee. See now what choice he maketh of our arguments, culling out thoſe that he was beſt able to deale with, and what ſlender ſhifts he maketh to auoid them. *He* a 1. Tim. 5. 8. *that prouideth not for his owne*, ſaith S. Paul, *and namely for them of his houſhold, hee denieth the faith, and is worſe then an infidell.* It muſt follow therefore, that there can bee no faith where this worke of charity is wilfully caſt off. *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that by faith is here meant either fidelitie as touching the performance of that we haue promiſed in baptiſme, or elſe the doctrine of faith. But let him expound it as he liſt, of either of them it ſhall yeeld an illation & conſequence of that which we affirme. For ſeeing the introduction of iuſtifying faith is b repentance from dead workes, iuſtifying faith b Mar. 1. 15. muſt alwaies implie a conſcience and care of conforming a mans ſelfe to the doctrine of the Goſpell, and to the promiſe and vowe that he hath made in baptiſme of obedience vnto God, and therefore where dead works ſtill raigne, it cannot be ſaid that iuſtifying faith hath there taken any place. Therefore he that ſhaketh off the yoke of the doctrine of the Goſpell, and by his conuerſation diſclaimeth the promiſe that he made in baptiſme, plainely ſheweth that howſoeuer hee profeſſe the faith, yet that hee hath no true faith abiding in him. And this the Apoſtle teacheth of him who is ſo inhumane and barbarous, as that the commandement of God cannot moue him to prouide for them, the care of whom euen infidels by inſtinct of nature doe know and conceiue to belong vnto them. But wee would gladly vnderſtand how *M. Biſhop* diuideth the articles of faith from the doctrine of faith. For what do the articles of faith containe but onely the doctrine of faith? That then-

contrary to the doctrine of faith, must needs also be contrary to the articles of faith. He therefore that by his deeds denieth the doctrin of faith, denieth in effect also the articles of his faith, howsoeuer with his tongue outwardly to men he make shew to confesse the same. *M. Bishops* answer then taketh not away the strength of this argument, but rather addeth further force and strength vnto it. But it is plaine by the very words that the Apostle vnderstandeth *faith* as it is opposed to *infidelity*, affirming that such, though they be *beleuers in name*, as *Hierome* speaketh, yet indeed are not beleuers. Therefore *Chrysostome* expounding the wordes by that saying of the same Apostle, [d] *They professe that they know God, but by their deedes they denie him*, inferreth, [e] *How doth hee beleeue that hath denied God?* The argument therefore is firme and sure, that howsoeuer there may be an outward profession of faith, yet indeed there is no faith where soeuer there wanteth correspondence of good worke.

c *Hieron. in 1. Tim. cap. 3 Fideles nomine.*

d *Tit. 1. 16.*

e *Chrysost. in 2. Tim. hom. 14. Quomodo huiusmodi credat qui Deum abnegauit?*

In the second place, it is strange to see how *M. Bishop* making choice of his aduersaries weapons, yet is foiled in his owne choice. The argument he saith is little worth: but sure I am, howsoeuer little worth it be, it is more worth then his answer. He setteth downe the words of S. *Iohn* according to his vulgar Latin, but according to the true text they are thus: [f] *But there are some of you that beleeue not: for Iesus knew from the beginning which they were that beleeued not, and who should betray him.* Where when the Euangelist setting downe Christ's words, *There are some of you which beleeue not*, inferreth as a reason of his speech, *for he knew who should betray him*, as if it had beene iointly, *There are some of you which beleeue not, for one of you shall betray me*; doth he not plainely demonstrate that the betraying of him could not stand with beleeuing, that he could not be a beleeuer that was to be the traitor? For what reason were it to say he beleeued not, for he was to betray him, if he might beleeue and yet betray him? Whereas *M. Bishop* saith, that *faith hath not alwaies fidelity & loue ioined with it*, he beggeth the question; but that which hee addeth of *falling away from the faith*, as if *Iudas* hauing before beleeued, were now relinquishing his faith, beside that it is the begging of another point in question also, it is excluded by the Euangelist, in that he noted that Iesus knew *from the beginning* that *Iudas* beleeued not. Which wordes, *from the beginning*, *M. Bishop*

f *Ioh. 6. 64.*

knowing

knowing that it the true reading of the text, noted also in the margin of his vulgar Latin, they would be preiudiciall to him, thought it a point of wisdome to conceale. But to speake of that faith which *Iudas* had, hee was not yet falling away from it: hee was yet an Apostle, and a preacher of the faith, and wee see that others departing from Christ, hee still continued with him, and gaue no outward token of vnbeleefe, and without doubt little thought now of doing that which afterwards hee did, which the Euangelist expressly noteth, that [g] *the diuell did* afterwards *put into his heart*. But yet there is a truth of faith, concerning which our Sauiour saith, intending his speech specially of him, *There are some of you which beleeue not*, which is not incident to any child of perdition, because it is Gods gift, as our Sauiour at large in that chapter expresseth, to them that [h] *come vnto him* by the same gift, whom beeing come, hee neuer [i] *casteth away* againe, and therefore they neuer lose that which they haue receiued.

g Ioh. 13. 2.

h Ioh. 6. 64. 65.

i Ver. 37.

Thirdly, he citeth for vs the words of Saint *Iohn*, [k] *He that saith, Know him, and keepeth not his commandements, is a liar, and the truth is not in him*. From which place wee argue, that because faith alwaies implieth knowledge of that wee beleeue, so as that where there is no knowledge, there is no faith, nor can be, it must needes follow, that sith there is no knowledge of God where there is no keeping of the commandements, therefore where there is no keeping of the commandements, there is no faith. Now by *knowledge* we vnderstand a true acknowledgement of that which wee beleeue, which is not a matter of bare [l] speculation by verball apprehension, such as whereby blind men talk of colours, & home-dwellers discourse of forrein countries where they neuer came, but an experimentall and approuing knowledge, an effectuall and feeling knowledge, to which, because it is the knowledge of faith, our Sauior attributeth eternall life, when he saith, [m] *This is life eternall, to know thee the onely true God, and Iesus Christ whom thou hast sent*: [n] *by which* the Apostle saith, *thou the new man is renewed according to the image of him that created him*. In which latter place wee are to obserue, that it is one thing to which we are renewed, and another thing, by which. The thing whereto we are renewed, is *the image of God*, which consisteth in charity: the thing whereby we are renewed is knowledge. Thus the Apostle *S. Peter* teacheth vs, that [o] *grace &*

k 1. Ioh. 2. 4.

l *Thom. Aquin. 2. 2. art. 2. ad 2. Duplex est cognitio diuinæ bonitatis vel voluntatis, vna quidem speculatiua, &c. Alia est affectiua siue experimentalis dum quis experitur in seipso gustum diuinæ dulcedinis & complacentiam diuinæ voluntatis, &c.*

m Ioh. 17. 3.

n Col. 3. 10.

o 2. Pet. 1. 2. 3.

peace

*peace is multiplied vnto vs by the knowledge of God, & of Iesus Christ our Lord*; that *the diuine power giueth vs all things pertaining to life and godlineſſe, through the knowledge of him that hath called vs.* Seeing then that *knowledge* heere is the thing whereby charity and all things pertaining to godlineſſe are miniſtred vnto vs, it ſhall be abſurd to expound knowledge to bee charity it ſelfe, albeit true it is that of this knowledge of God, euen as of faith, there enſueth alwaies charity and loue. This true and liuely and effectuall knowledge it is of which Saint *Iohn* here ſpeaketh, giuing to vnderſtand that barren and idle and fruitleſſe knowledge is indeed no knowledge, and that howſoeuer a man ſeeme able to ſay much, yet that hee talketh but as by hereſay, not knowing what hee ſaith, if his knowledge be not ſuch as ſeaſon his heart to the loue and keeping of the commandements of God. Becauſe then true faith cannot be without this true knowledge, and this true knowledge cannot be where there is not the keeping of Gods commandements, it muſt follow, as I ſaid before, that there is no faith where there is no keeping of the commandements of God. Now although *M. Biſhop* alledge a place or two, where there is a neceſſity of expounding Gods *knowledge* towards vs in other ſort then the word ſeemeth to import, yet hee bringeth none to import any neceſſity of making the ſame conſtruction of our knowledge towards God. Let it bee granted him that Gods knowledge may import his loue, yet I ſuppoſe he cannot ſhew vs any where, that *to know God*, is to bee expounded ſimply *to loue God*. As for the *lier*, let him keepe it to himſelfe, becauſe hee beſt deſerueth it: hee hath taken paines for it, and no reaſon that any man ſhould bereaue him of his right. We profeſſe the knowledge of God, and we profeſſe and teach the keeping of Gods commandements, although wee alſo teach, that by reaſon of our corruption and weakneſſe it is vnpoſſible for vs ſo long as wee liue heere, to keepe them perfectly and in ſuch ſort as thereby to be iuſtified in the ſight of God. If *M. Biſhop* will ſay that he keepeth them, I am ſure that he is a lier, and as *Hierome* did the Pelagian heretike, ſo do I put him * to bring in example of any other that hath ſo done.

* *Hieron. ad Ctesiphont. Profer quis impleuerit.*

The laſt place he draweth in backwards and by force, there beeing no man of vs that alledgeth it to the purpoſe here in hand. He maketh his choice, as we ſee, to ſerue his own turne. Becauſe he had

no

no great skill to answer, he thought it wisdome to take heed what he did obiect. But yet out of that sentence truly alledged, we may take somewhat to this point. The words are, p *The iust shall liue by faith.* According to these words, true faith is said alwaies to imply and containe eternall life. Our Sauior Christ speaketh as of a thing presently had: q *He that beleeueth, hath eternall life; he is passed from death to life.* But without charitie there can be no state of eternall life, because r *he that loueth not, abideth in death.* If then where soeuer there be true faith, there be eternall life, and without charitie there can be no eternall life, it must necessarily follow, that where soeuer there is true faith, there is also charitie, and loue bringing forth the fruites of good workes, and seeking to winne others by example of iust and holy life. *M. Bishops* answer we see giueth checke to the holy Ghost. The holy Ghost saith, *The iust shall liue by faith.* Not so, saith *M. Bishop*: he liueth by faith, hope and charitie, and not by faith alone. Further I trouble not my selfe with his idle words, which containe nothing but a begging of the matter in question, and are applied onely to an argument of his owne deuice.

p Gal. 3. 11.
q Ioh. 3. 36. 1 Cap. 5. 24.
r 1. Ioh. 3. 14.

## Chapter 5.

# OF MERITS.

### I. W. Bishop.

*OBserue that three things are necessary to make a worke meritorious: First, that the worker be the adopted sonne of God, and in the state of grace. Secōdly, that the work proceed from grace, and be referred to the honour of God. The third, is the promise of God through Christ to reward the worke. And because our aduersaries, either ignorantly or of malice do slander this our doctrine, in saying vntruly that we trust not in Christs merits, nor need not Gods mercy for our saluation, but wil purchase it by our owne works: I wil here set downe what the Councell of Trent doth teach concerning Merits: Life euerlasting* Sess. 6. cap. vlt.
is to be proposed to them that work wel, and hope wel to the end; both as grace, of mercie promised to the sonnes of God through Christ Iesus, and as a reward by the promise of the same God to

be

be faithfull rendred vnto their workes and merits. *So that we hold eternall life to be both a grace, as well in respect of Gods free promise through Christ, as also for that the first grace (out of which they issue) was freely bestowed vpon vs. And that also it is a reward in iustice, due partly by the promise of God, and in part for the dignitie of good workes vnto the worker, if he perseuere and hold on vnto the end of his life, or by true repentance rise to the same estate againe. In infants baptized, there is a kind of merit, or rather dignitie of the adopted sonnes of God, by his grace powred into their soules in baptisme, whereby they are made heires of the kingdom of heauen, but al that arriue to the yeares of discretion, most by the goodwise of the same grace either merit life, or for want of such fruite of it, fall into the miserable state of death.*

R. Abbot.

*M. Bishop* setteth downe three things, which he saith are necessary to make a work meritorious, but giueth vs no ground at al whereby we may rest perswaded, that where those three things do concurre, a man may be said to *merit or deserue* at Gods hands. He leaueth vs still to wonder, that a sinnfull wretch offending and prouoking God from day to day, should dare to talke of merite and desert with God, but that we know that heresie and ignorance make men bold to frame the maiestie of God to their owne brainsicke and senslesse conceits. The conditions and circumstances by him mentioned, we alwayes teach and require in our doctrine of good workes, but farre are we from finding merit in any of them. For first, the adopted sonne of God standeth bound by dutie to do all things *to the honor of his Father*, and therefore can be no merit in doing that which a man by dutie is bound to do. Secondly, if the worke proceed from the grace of God, the worke is Gods & not mans, and therfore man can therby merit nothing. Thirdly if the reward depend vpon promise, then it ariseth not of the merit or worth of workes, especially there being by the frailtie of the worker and the bountie of the promiser that disproportion betwixt the worke and the reward, as that it is meerly absurd to imagine, that the one should be merited and deserued by the other. These things (God willing) shall further appeare in the processe of this

this question. In the meane time *M. Bishop* here challengeth vs for slandering their doctrine with some matters of vntruth, as *that they trust not in Christs merits, that they need not Gods mercy for their saluation, but will purchase it by their owne workes.* Now wee wote well that they vse speech of Christes merits, and Gods mercie and of trusting therein, because they know that if they abandoned the mention hereof, they would soone grow odious and hatefull to all men. For the cupp: of poison of the whore of Babylon they must vse a couer of such good words, least they make men loath to drinke thereof. But let it bee examined how they teach these things, and their falshood will soone appeare. By *trust in Christs merits*, men conceiue the placing of the confidēce of saluation immediatly therein, as the proper cause for which God accepteth vs to eternall life, who our selues are miserable sinners, and altogether vnworthy thereof. But their trust in Christs merits, is that he hath purchased for vs grace, if wee list by *free will* to merit heauen for our selues, thereby to be iust before God in our selues, and worthy of the Kingdome of heauen, as *M. Bishop* in the former question of [a] *iustification* hath declared. So then the effect of Christs merits is tied onely to this life, and thenceforth we are to depend vpon that which here we do for our selues, by well vsing that grace which the merits of Christ first purchased for vs. Therefore one *Richard Hopkins* translating into English a Booke of *Granatensis*, as touching *prayer and meditation*, giueth it one where for a marginall note, that *our Saviour Christ is our Aduocate for the time of this life, but after our departure out of this life he is no more our aduocate, but our Iudge, for the time is past* (saith he) *of dealing with God by an Aduocate, &c. and we shall haue our definitiue sentence according to our workes.* Whereby it appeareth what reckoning they make of the *mercie of God*, which they also pen vp within the compasse of this life, and denie it that place which the Apostle giueth it, *but that day.* Yea so little vse is there with them of Gods mercie, as that *M. Bishop* doubteth not to demaund, [c] *What needeth a iustified man greatly feare the rigorous sentence of a iust iudge?* Hence are those most insolent speeches of theirs, that good workes are [d] *truly and properly meritorious, and fully worthy of euerlasting life; that heauen is the due and iust stipend which God by his iustice oweth to the persons working by his grace; that we haue*

a *Sect.* 2.

b 2. Tim. 1. 8.

c Cap. 4. Sect. 4.

d Rhem. Anno. 2. Tim. 4. 8.

*a*

*a right to heauen, and deſerue it worthily; that it is our owne right, bargained for and wrought for, and accordingly payed vnto vs as our hire:* [c] *that good works be ſo farre meritorious, as that God ſhould bee vniuſt if hee rendered not heauen for the ſame.* Thereuppon *Tapper* ſticketh not to ſay, [f] *God forbid that the iuſt ſhould expect eternall life as the poore man doth an almes: for it is much more glorious that they ſhould haue it as conquerers and triumphers, as the prize due vnto their labours.* Thus you your ſelues haue written *M. Biſhop*, and do we ſlander you in reporting truly what you haue written? No, no, your ſpeeches are impudent and ſhameleſſe in this behalfe, and ſuch as wee wonder that your foreheads ſerue you to auouch. Why doth it not ſuffice you to preach good workes ſimply, as Chriſt and his Apoſtles did, with commendation of Gods mercie in rewarding the ſame? What need this vaine foolery of merite, ſo improbable, ſo abſurd, ſo impoſſible, whereby you do not magnifie God, but ſet vp the righteouſneſſe of man againſt the grace of God? As for the definition of the Councell of Trent, wee eſteeme it not, knowing the ſame for the moſt part to haue beene but a conuenticle of baſe Italinate Machiauels, who by equiuocations and ſophiſtications haue deluded the world, and by caſting the chaffe of ſome phraſes of the Fathers vpon the meeres and puddles of the ſchoolemen, haue laboured to couer and hide the filth and mire thereof, and indeed haue left them ſtill to ſerue by falſe confidence and truſt for gulfes and whirlpools to ſwallow vp and deuoure the ſoules of men. Although the words of the Councell may beare ſome good conſtruction according to the ancient Fathers meaning of the name of merits, yet by them they are deceiptfully ſet downe to leaue open a gappe to the abſurd and intollerable preſumption of men, in aduancing and lifting vp the deſert of mens workes, as if God were thereby greatly bound and beholding vnto them. How farre their meaning extendeth, will appeare by *M. Biſhop*, who will not haue vs thinke that hee will ſpeake any thing but by the authority of that Councell. And firſt hee telleth vs, that they hold that *eternall life is a grace*; which indeed they dare not denie, becauſe the Scripture expreſly ſo affirmeth, [g] *Eternall life is the grace (or gift) of God through Ieſus Chriſt our Lord.* But he addeth to grace a ſupply of works, quite contrary to the Scriptures; for it is expreſly ſaid, [h] *If it be of grace, it is not of works; otherwiſe*

c Iid. Heb. 6. 10.

f Ruard. Tapper. in explicat. art. Louan. tom. 2. art. 9. *Abſit vt iuſti vitam æternam expectent ſicut pauper eleemoſynam. Multò namque glorioſius eſt ipſos quaſi victores & triumphatores eam poſſidere tanquam palmam ſuis ſudoribus debitam.*

g Rom 6. 23.

h Chap. 11. 6.

otherwise grace is no grace. † *Grace* (saith Saint *Austin*) *is not grace in any sort if it be not free in euery sort.* It is of grace, saith *M. Bishop*, and yet it is of workes also. But still to make a shew of vpholding grace, he telleth vs that though eternall life be by workes, yet *the first grace, out of which those workes do issue, is freely bestowed vpon vs.* Which he saith onely as ashamed to deny grace altogether, and not of any conscience that hee maketh faithfully to auouch the same. For if the grace, whence those workes doe issue, which is the grace of iustification, be freely bestowed vpon vs, why doth he before labour to approue that we are iustified by works? Or if wee obtaine the grace of iustification by works, how doth hee say that the same is freely bestowed vpon vs? The plaine truth is, that by their *works of preparation* they make a man at least *in some sort*, as we haue heard before out of *Bellarmine*, to merit & deserue euen the first grace, if by *the first grace* we vnderstand the grace of their *first iustification*, as *M. Bishop* vsually doth. But beside grace, *it is also a reward due in iustice*, saith he. And how so? Marry *partly by the promise of God.* Now if he rested here, we would not contend with him. For promise is indeed grace, and iustice in respect of promise is nothing but truth in the performance thereof, neither is here any impeachment of the free gift of God. But not contended heerwith, hee addeth, that it is *due in part also for the dignitie of good workes.* And thus he confoundeth those things which the Scriptures still very precisely distinguish, aduertizing vs that * *if they which are of the law* (that is of workes) *be heirs, then is faith made voide, and the promise is made of none effect:* and againe, ‖ *if the inheritance bee of the law* (that is, of workes) *it is no longer by promise.* To bee inheritors *by workes*, and to bee inheritors *by promise*, are things so opposite as that the one wholly excludeth the other, neither can they possibly stand together. As for that which hee saith of *infants merit and dignitie*, it is also the schoolemens fiction and deuice. Remission of sinnes is their Saluation as it is ours, and in them it standeth good which the Apostle saith, ¶ *As sinne hath raigned* (ouer them) *vnto death, so grace also raigneth by righteousnesse* (that is, by imputation of righteousnesse) *vnto eternall life*, not by any dignitie in them, but *through Iesus Christ our Lord.* But as touching them that *arriue to yeares of discretion*, hee telleth vs that *either they must by good vse of grace merite life, or for want of such fruite*

i *Augustin. contra Pelag. & Celest. lib. 2. ca. 24. Non enim gratia Dei gratia erit vllo modo, nisi fuerit gratuita omni modo.*

k Rom. 4. 14.

l Gal. 3. 18.

m Rom. 5. 21.

fall

*fall into the miserable state of death.* A very hard sentence for himselfe, for if hee neuer haue life till he merite and deserue it, we can well assure him that he shall go without it. And I wonder that his heart did not tremble at the writing hereof, but that he hath hardned the same against the truth, and writeth but onely for maintenance of that occupation and trade, that must yeeld maintenance backe againe to him. What will hee say in the end, when hee shall lie wrastling with death, and ready to resigne his soule into the hands of God? Will he then craue for mercy, who writeth now so earnestly for merite? Let him take heede that God do not then answer him, [n] *Out of thine owne mouth will I iudge thee, thou euill seruant.* Thou hast despised my mercie. Thou hast defined, that euery one that doth not merit life must fall into the state of death. Thy sentence shall stand good against thy selfe: thou art farre off from meriting life, and therfore thy iust portion shal be euerlasting death. Let him learn in time to feare his doome, and leaue off by this wilfull oppugning of the faith and doctrine of Christ to rebell against God.

n Luke 19. 22.

## 2. W. Bishop.

*With this Catholike doctrine* M. Perkins *would bee thought to agree in two points: First,* That merits are necessary to saluation: *Secondly,* That Christ is the root and fountaine of all merit. *But soone after like vnto a shrewd cow, ouerthrowes with his heele the good milke he had giuen before: renouncing all merits in euery man, saning onely in the person of Christ: whose prerogatiue (saith he) it is, to be the person alone in whom God is wel pleased. Then he addeth, that they good Protestants by Christs merits really imputed to them, do merit life euerlasting. Euē as by his righteousnesse imputed vnto them, they are iustified and made righteous.*

*To which I answer, that wee most willingly confesse our blessed Sauiours merits to be infinite, and of such diuine efficacie, that hee hath not onely merited at his Fathers hands both pardon for all faults, and grace to do all good workes, but also that his true seruants workes should be meritorius of life euerlasting. As for the reall imputation of his merits to vs, we esteeme as a fained imagination, compossed of contrarieties.*

For

*For if it be really in vs, why do they call it imputed? and if it be ours only by Gods imputation, then is it not in vs really. Further, to say that he onely is the person in whom God is well pleased, is to giue the lye vnto many plaine texts of holy Scriptures.* Abraham *was called the friend of God; therefore God was well pleased in him:* Moyses *was his beloued:* Dauid *was a man according vnto his owne heart: God loued Christs Disciples, because they loued him. Briefly, all the Christians at Rome, were truly called of S.* Paule *the beloued of God. And therefore although God be best pleased in our Sauiour, and for his sake is pleased in all others, yet is he not onely pleased in him, but in all his faithfull seruants. Now to that which he saith, that they haue no other merit then Christs imputed to them, as they haue no other righteousnesse but by imputation, I take it to be true: and therefore they do very ingeniously and iustly renounce all kind of merits in their stained and defiled workes. But let thē tremble at that which thereupon necessarily followeth, It is, that as they haue no righteousnesse or merit of heauen, but onely by a supposed imputation, so they must looke for no heauen but by imputation: for God as a most vpright iudge, will in the end repay euery man according to his worth: wherefore not finding any reall worthynesse in Protestants, but onely in conceipt, his reward shall be giuen them answerably, in conceipt onely: which is euidently gathered out of* S. Austine, *where he saith:* That the reward cannot go before the merit, nor be giuen to a man before he be worthy of it: for (*saith he*) what were more iust then that, and what is more iust then God? *Where he concludeth that we must not be so hardie as once to demaund, much lesse so impudent as to assure our selues of that crowne, before we haue deserued it. Seeing then that the protestants by this their proffer renounce al such merit and desert, they must needes also renounce their part of heauen, and not presume so much as once to demaund it, according vnto* S. Augustines *sentence, vntill they haue first renounced their erronious opinion.*

Jac 2. Eccles. 45. Act. 13. Joh 16. Rom. 1.

Lib. 1. de mori. Eccles. cap. 25.

## R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins* hath indeed giuen good milke, as *M. Bishop* saith, euen a *the syncere milke of the word,* which he had drawne from b *the brests of the Church,* the old and the new Testament, the writings of the Apostles & Prophets, which are c *the foundations whereupon the house of God is built.* He plaid not the shrewd cow, to ouerthrow it when he had giuen it, but what he gaue *M. Bishop* seeketh to cor-

a 1. Pet. 2. 2.
b *August. in Joan. Epist. trac. 3. Est mater Ecclesia; & vbera eius duo Testamenta Scripturarum diuinarum.*
c Ephes 2. 20.

rupt by blending and mingling with it, not the leauen onely, but the very poiſon of humaine traditions. He renounceth, and ſo do we, all merit but what is in the perſon of Ieſus Chriſt for vs, and thereby onely do we lay hold of eternall life, acknowledging that not for any thing that we do, but onely [d] *in him the Father is well pleaſed* towards vs, and accepteth vs to be his children, and heires of his kingdome. Whereas in his pleaſance he tearmeth vs *good Proteſtants*, I muſt tell him as before, that if the Proteſtants do not exceed the goodneſſe of them who will be taken to be the very beſt amongſt the Papiſtes, without queſtion they are very bad: and I doubt not but he himſelfe will acquit the proteſtants from being ſo bad as he and his fellowes haue told vs that their good maiſters the Ieſuits be. But for anſwer he ſaith, that Chriſt *did merit for his, not onely pardon of all faults, and grace to do all good workes, but alſo that their workes ſhould be meritorious of life euerlaſting*. A ſtrange ſpeech, and ſuch as the Apoſtles and Primitiue Church were not acquainted with. Forſooth Chriſt did not merit eternall life for vs, but he merited for vs grace, that ſo we might merit eternall life for our ſelues. Now *M. Biſhop* hath taught vs before, that grace is nothing, but as *Freewill* adioyneth it ſelfe vnto it, and ſo the concluſion is, that the grace of God doth not ſaue man, but man by the helpe of grace doth ſaue himſelfe. Thus the matter reſteth vpon vs, Chriſt offereth vs grace; we may receiue it, if we will; and when we haue it, we may, if we will, thereby deſerue eternal life, other wiſe we go without it. But the ſcripture teacheth vs farre otherwiſe, that [e] *the record that God hath witneſſed of his Sonne is this; that God hath giuen vs eternall life, and this life is in his Sonne*. Here is no record, that God hath giuen vs grace to deſerue eternall lrfe, but that he hath giuen vs eternall life; nor that this life is in our merits, but that this life is in his Sonne, ſo as that [f] *he that beleeueth in the Sonne, hath euerlaſting life*, and [g] *they that beleeue in the name of the Sonne of God, are to know, that they haue eternall life*, God by the beginning giuing them certificate and aſſurance of the end. The reall imputation of Chriſts merits to vs, is no fained imagination, but a cleare truth, as hath bene before ſhewed. The contrarietie and oppoſition that he conceiueth therin, is his owne fond dreame, no doctrine of ours. We do not ſay, that Chriſts merits are *really in vs*, neither did *Maiſter Perkins* giue

d Mat. 3. 17.

e 1. Ioh. 5. 10. 11

f Ioh. 3. 36.

g 1. Ioh. 5. 13.

giue him any word whereof to imagine it, but onely that by imputation they are made *really ours*, becauſe they were vndertaken and done for vs, euen as Chriſt the doer thereof is become *really ours, euen* [h] *the Lord our righteouſneſſe*. Whereas hee ſaith, that *to ſay, that Chriſt onely is the perſon in whom God is well pleſed, is to giue the lie to many texts of Scripture*, which teſtifie, that God hath beene pleaſed towards *Abraham, Moyſes, &c.* wee ſuppoſe hee doth not well vnderſtand himſelfe. It is ſaid of many, that God was pleaſed with them, or they pleaſed God, but the queſtion is, in whom, for whoſe ſake, by whoſe mediation God was well pleaſed towardes them, and that was onely in Chriſt, onely for Chriſts ſake, accordingly as the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* ſaith of all the elect: [i] *He hath made vs accepted in his beloued*, and Saint *Peter*, that our [k] *ſpirituall ſacrifices are acceptable to God by Ieſus Chriſt*. And this prerogatiue the voice of the Father giueth him from heauen: [l] *This is my beloued Sonne in whom I am well pleaſed*: namely, towards *Abraham, Iſaac, Iacob, Moſes, Dauid*, and all towards whom he is well pleaſed. Which ſeeing it was the plaine meaning of *M. Perkins*, and *M. Biſhop* acknowledgth it to bee true, that *Chriſt is hee, for whoſe ſake God is pleaſed in all others*, what is it but childiſh and idle cauilling to make a queſtion there, where by his owne confeſſion none is to be made? Now where wee ſay, that wee haue no righteouſneſſe to iuſtifie vs before God, but only the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, nor any merit whereby to preſume of heauen, but only the merit of Chriſt, all our owne workes beeing blemiſhed and ſtained with ſinne, he biddeth vs *tremble at that which thereupon neceſſarilie followeth*. And what is that? Marry, that *as wee haue no righteouſneſſe but by imputation, ſo wee muſt looke for no heauen but by imputation*. But why ſhould we not think, that the merit of Chriſts obedience and righteouſneſſe is of ſufficient value and eſtimation to purchaſe for vs the kingdome of heauen, and euerlaſting glory? Is it ſufficient to purchaſe grace for vs to merit heauen for our ſelues, and is it not ſufficient it ſelfe to merit heauen for vs? And if wee haue no merit of our owne, what ſhould hinder but that wee may ſay with Saint *Bernard*: [m] *Whatſoeuer is wanting*

h Ier. 23. 6.

i Ephes. 1. 6.
k 1. Pet. 2. 5.

l Mat. 3. 17.

m Bernard. in Cant. Ser. 61. *Ego fidenter quicquid ex me mihi deeſt, vſurpo mihi ex viſceribus Domini: quoniam miſericordia affluunt &c. Meritum proinde meum miſerationes Domini. Non plane ſum meriti inops, quamdiu ille miſerationum non fuerit. Quod ſi miſericordiæ Domini multæ, multi mihi meritus ego in meritis ſum.*

*to me of my ſelfe,, I boldly take it vnto me out of the bowels of the Lord, for they flow out with mercy. My merit is the Lords mercy: I am not poore in merit, ſo long as hee is not poore in mercy: and if hee be rich in mercy, then am I alſo rich in merits.* Yea, *Bellarmine M. Biſhops* maſter, after that hee hath ſweat and trauelled mightily to auouch the righteouſneſſe and merit of workes, in the end beeing quite ſpent is content to retire into our port, & draweth to this concluſion, that [n] *becauſe of the vncertainty of our owne righteouſneſſe, and the perill of vaine glorie, the ſafeſt way is to repoſe our whole truſt in the only mercy and goodneſſe of God.* Now if there be no ſaluation, no heauen without merits, and a man haue no merites of his owne, by what merits ſhall the mercy of God ſaue him, but only by the imputation of the merits of Chriſt? And will *M. Biſhop* ſay of him, that as he hath no merits but by imputation, ſo he ſhal haue no heauen but by imputation? Shall this be all the comfort of that which *Bellarmine* commendeth for the ſafeſt courſe, to flie to the ſole and onely mercy and goodneſſe of God? Yea, ſaith *M. Biſhop: for God as a moſt vpright iudge will in the end repay euery man according to his woorth.* What, and doe you *M. Biſhop* expect, that God in the end ſhould repay heauen to you *according to your woorth*? Goe foole, goe, leaue off this talke of merit and woorth: learne to know God, learne to know thy ſelfe, learne to ſay with *Chryſoſtome*: [o] *No man ſheweth ſuch conuerſation of life, as that he may be worthy of the kingdome, but it is wholly the gift of God.* Was not [p] *Iohn Baptiſt worthy to looſe the latchet of Chriſts ſhoe*, and doſt thou thinke to be worthie to raigne with Chriſt? But I leaue him heere to be whipped with his owne rod: his own conſcience will one day ſting him ſufficiently with the remembrance of theſe aſſertions. As for the Proſtants, let him take no care for their worthineſſe. Wee beleeue that there is for vs in Chriſt a reall worthineſſe, for which we ſhall receiue a reall heauen. But let him take heede, leſt whileſt hee feedeth himſelfe with a conceipt of worth where there is none, hee be deluded with a conceipt of heauen in his end, and indeede find none, nor euer attaine to that which is prepared for them that maintaine the truth of the Scripture, and glorie of God to their owne comfort. But of worthineſſe there will be further occaſion to ſpeak hereafter. As for the place of *Auſtine* which he alledgeth as good to ſtand for him, it was written by him when hee was newly conuerted from the hereſie

[n] Bellar. de iuſt. lib. 5. cap. 7. Propter incertitudinē propriæ iuſtitiæ, & periculum inanis gloriæ tutiſſimum eſt fiduciam totam in ſola Dei miſericordia & benignitate reponere.

[o] Chryſoſt. in Col. hom. 2. Nemo talem vitæ conuerſationem oſtendit, vt regno dignus eſſe poſſit, ſed totū donum eſt ipſius Dei.

[p] Mar. 1. 7.

hereſie of the Manichees in ſuch words and phraſes as ſeeme plauſible to humane vnderſtanding and iudgement, which comparing one man with another, expreſſeth to it ſelfe the difference by termes of worthy and vnworthy, deſeruing and not deſeruing, howſoeuer to the ſight & iudgement of God woorth & deſert are farre from all. The purpoſe of *S. Auſtine* in that place, is to ſhew the ordinary courſe that God taketh, that hee will firſt haue vs to trauell in his ſeruice, before we receiue the reward thereof, as the Apoſtle declareth in ſaying, [q] *The husbandman muſt labor before he receiue the fruits.* But that *S. Auſtine* in maturity and ripeneſſe of iudgement was very farre from *M. Biſhops* fancy of merit, may ſufficiently appeare by one ſentence of his where he ſaith, [r] *God promiſed to men participation with God immortality to mortall creatures, iuſtification to ſinners, glorification to abiects and caſt awaies. Whatſoeuer he promiſed he promiſed to men vnworthy, that it might not bee promiſed as a reward to merits: but being grace might accordingly to the name be free, bi cauſe freely giuen, becauſe voluntarily, ſo far as a man can iuſtly vſe a maſter imparting means, merit, but the benefit and gift of God.* Where plainely he ſheweth, that whatſoeuer God hath promiſed, it is his meere and only gift: that to ſpeake ſimply thereof, it is to be hereſied of the title of a reward of merites, becauſe God promiſed the ſame when we had no works: that it is not giuen for our woorth, becauſe it was promiſed when wee had no woorthyneſſe: and that we haue any good workes, it is an effect of the ſame promiſe, it cannot be thought to make any merit on our behalfe, but to ſet forth grace and mercy on Gods behalfe: ſo that all is free gift, all is grace and mercie, and the adding of one gift, and grace, and mercy to another, howſoeuer ſometimes in ſome reſpects, as hereafter we ſhall ſee, the gift of God is ſet foorth vnto vs vnder the name of *recompence and reward*. In a word, by that that followeth I doubt not but it will appeare, that the *Remiſh Proteſter*, if he muſt needs be ſo rearmed, hath ſaid nothing in this behalfe, but what by *S. Auſtine* and other ancient Fathers may well be defended againſt this *Remiſh Prayer*, who hath great inſolencie of words, but ſound matter of proofe hee cauſed none at all.

q 2. Tim. 2. 6.

r *Auguſt. in Pſal. 109. Promiſit hominibus diuinitatem, mortalibus immortalitatem, peccatoribus iuſtificationem, abiectis glorificationem. Quicquid promiſit, ſumpſit promiſit, ne non quaſi mercedi operibus promitteretur, ſed gratis a homine ſuo gratis daretur, quia & hoc ipſum quod iuſtè viuit, in quantum homo eſt iuſtè viuere non meritis humanis, ſed beneficij diuini eſt.*

3. W. Bishop.

*But M. Perkins will nevertheless preove, and that by sundry reasons, that their doctrine is the truth it selfe, and ours falshood.*

*First, by a very short syllogism contayning more then one whole page. It is taken out of the properties of a Mathematicall worke: which must bee (saith he) foure: first,* That the worke be done of our selues, without the helpe of another: *secondly,* That it bee not otherwise due debt: *thirdly,* That it be done to the benefit of another: *fourthly,* That the worke and reward be equall in proportion. *These properties he setteth downe pythagorically without any proofe: but inferreth thereon, as though he had proved them unanswerably, that Christs manhood separated from the Godhead cannot merit: because whatsoever hee doth, hee doth it by grace received, and should be otherwise due. Hee might in like manner as truly say, that Christs manhood united to the Godhead, could not merit neither: for he received his Godhead from his Father, and whatsoever he doth, is therefore his Fathers by due debt. And so the good man, if he were let alone, would disappoint us wholly of all merits, as well the impute of Christs, as of all ours done by vertue of his grace. Wherefore we must a little stay him for his proprieties of Merit: and touching the first, That the worke may be the cause of a thing received by free gift, merit and deserve much more at his hands that gave it. For example, the Father bestowes a Farme upon his sonne freely; who may by often presenting his Father of the pleasant fruits growing on the same deserve his further favour: yea, he may by the commodities reaped out of that farme, buy anything that shall please his father to sell to his sonne, as well as if he had never received the farme from his fathers gift: which is so common a case, and so sensible, that every man of meane wit, may easily reach unto it: even so by good manuring the gift which God freely bestoweth upon us, we may both merit the increase of them, and according to his owne order and promise, purchase thereby the kingdome of heaven: which is plainely proved by that parable,* Of the talents given by a King to his servants; *the which they employing well and multiplying, were ever after esteemed worthy of farre greater, and withall to bee made partakers of their Lords joyes.*

Mat. 25.

M. Perkins *then was not a little overseene, to put for the first propriety of merit, that it must be done by a man, and of a man himselfe.*

R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins* saith very truly, vpon noting the conditions necessarily required in a meritorious worke, that the manhood of Christ considered apart from his Godhead, because it is but a creature, and hath all by the gift of God, and doth all by bond of necessary dutie, cannot merit at Gods hands. Whereas *M. Bishop* against this saith, that *he might in like manner as truly say, that Christs manhood vnited to the Godhead could not merit neither, because he received his Godhead from the Father, and therefore whatsoeuer he doth is his Fathers by due debt*, he bewrayeth his notable and absurd ignorance. For Christ receiueth his Godhead of the Father to be equall to the Father, not inferiour, to be the same in substance, and maiestie, and glorie, that the Father is. Now duty and debt do necessarily enforce minoritie and subiection. Seeing therefore there is no minority or subiection in the Godhead of the Sonne towards the Father, there can be no debt or dutie of the Sonne in that respect towards the Father. Thus the good man (to repay him with his owne soute) is taken before he is aware in the nets of the Arian heresie, which made Christ as God inferiour and subiect to the Father. The merit of Christ therefore consisted in this, as *S. Paul* noteth, that *being equall* to God his Father, and owing no debt or dutie, did voluntary humble himselfe to obedience and dutie for our sakes. So then *M. Perkins*, indeed a *good man*, as *M. Bishop* shall one day see, hath not by his assertion bereaued vs of the merits of Christ, but hath taught how rightly to vnderstand the same. But now he will *a little life*, as he saith, *the foure forged proprieties of merit*, which *M. Perkins* hath set downe. Whether they be forged or not, will appear by the sequele in the meane time his answers to them may seeme rather to haue come from the Smiths forge, then out of the studie, and from the learning of a Doctor of Diuinitie. The first condition required in a *meritorious worke*, properly so to be called, to which by dutie, debt and right for the workes sake, reward is due vnto it, is that a man do it of himselfe, and by his owne power. For so saith *Hilarie*: [a] *Vnto him a merit, whatsoeuer it is, to himselfe the author of getting his merit.* Therefore *S. Bernard* hauing said that *the merits of men are not such, as that they can eternally by right in owing*

[a] *Hilar. de Trin. lib. 12. Meriti eius est qui ipse sibi meriti acquirendi author extitit.*

[b] *Bernard. in Annunciat. ser. 1 Non talia sunt hominis merita vt propter ea vita æterna debeatur ex iure, &c. Nam merita omnia Dei dona sunt, & ita longe magis propter ipsa Deo debitor est quam Deus homini.*

*for them,* giueth this for one reason thereof, *because all Merits are the gifts of God, and so man is rather a debtor to God for thē then God to man.* So *Origen* saith, that [c] *he can hardly be perswaded, that there can be any worke, which by debt may require reward at Gods hands, in so much as it is by his gift that we are able to doe, or thinke, or speake any thing that is good.* By this reason S. *Austine*, [d] though according to the language of his time, he vseth the name of merit, yet taketh away the true nature of merit, by bereauing the righteousnes of man of hauing any thing *due vnto it.* *Eternal life* (saith he) *should be rendred as due vnto thee, if of thy selfe thou hadst the righteousnesse to which it is due: but now of his fulnesse we receiue not onely grace vnto vse fully in our labours to the end, but also grace for this grace, that afterwards we may liue in rest without end.* Here is then nothing due vnto vs, and therefore no merit, because whatsoeuer righteousnesse is in vs, it is onely Gods gift vnto vs. This reason in sundry places he giueth against opinion of hauing God *a debtor vnto vs* by our doings, against the conceipt of *our worthinesse*, or thinking that we haue any thing due vnto vs for the good workes that wee performe, because of God it is that we haue all. But M. *Bishops* head is sufficient to answer this, and that with greater depth of wit assure your selfe, then is to be found in the heades of any Protestant whatsoeuer. *A man* (saith hee) *may by the good vse of a thing receiued by free gift, merit and deserue much more at his hands, that gaue it.* For example sooth: *The father bestowes a Farme vpon his sonne freely, who may by often presenting his Father of the increase thereof, deserue of him further fauour, yea by the encrease thereof may grow to be able to buy any thing that his father hath for to sell.* Surely this reason is very farmerlike, and smelleth more strongly of the cart then it doth of the Bible. But for answer, If a man bestow a thing vpon another, and the same can make no good vse thereof, but by his hand and helpe that gaue it him, is he not in all that redoundeth to him bound to him, by whose gift hee first enioyed that which he hath, and by whose onely hand he maketh vse and profite of it? If a father bestow a Farme on his sonne, and the sonne can do no good therwith but by his Father: if hee increase nothing, raise nothing, but what is raised and increased to him by his father: if hee bee not able of himselfe so much as to stirre a hand to helpe himselfe, but his father doth all for him, shall wee thinke

[c] *Origen in Ro. cap. 4. Vix mihi suadeo vllum opus esse posse, quod ex debitore remuneratione Dei deposcat: cum etiam hoc ipsum quod agere aliquid possumus, vel cogitare vel proloqui, ipsius dono & largitione faciamus.*

[d] *Aug. Epist. 105 Tibi tanquam debita redderetur si ex te tibi esset sustinia cui debetur. Nunc de plenitudine eius accepimus non solū gratiam qua nunc iustē in laboribus vsque in finem viuimus, sed etiam gratiam pro hac gratia vt in requie postea sine fine viuamus.*

[e] *Idem in Psal. 32. & in Ioan. tract. 3.*

[f] *In Psal. 43. in fine.*

thinke that by the increase and profit that ariseth therof, the seruant meriteth and deserueth any thing at his Fathers hands? can he giue the Father any thing, but what was first the fathers gift to him? But so is the case with vs. God hath bestowed vpon vs his calling and grace; but what are we the neere, if his hand do not still work for vs who hath said [g] *Without me ye can do nothing*; who in the beginning and to the end [h] *worketh in vs, both to will and to doe*; so that we haue [i] *nothing to speak of, but what Christ hath done by vs*; [k] *nothing reioyce or glory of, because we haue not any thing of our owne, not any thing of our own but sinne and sinne*, so that we can yeeld nothing to God but what is his, [l] *who hath wrought all our workes for vs*, [m] *of whom, and for whom, and through whom are all things, that he may be blessed for euer*. Therfore the auncient Church taught against *Pelagius* the heretick, [n] *that the grace of God is giuen to euery seuerall action*. [o] *We must know*, saith Hierome, *that we are nothing if he himselfe do not keepe in vs that which hee hath giuen. God is still giuing, still bestowing: it sufficeth me not that he hath once giuen, vnlesse he be still giuing: I pray to receiue, and when I haue receiued, I pray againe.* This is it that wee are here to vnderstand, that not onely the first grace, but whatsoeuer consequently we haue or do towards God, it is altogether and wholly of the gift of God, and therefore in nothing can we bee said to merit or deserue at Gods hands, because we cannot binde God as a debtor vnto vs, by any thing that is his owne. But [p] *Master Bisso* maketh no more account but this, that God hath giuen him a *Farme*, and by the well husbanding of it he must grow rich, and then make a further purchase of God againe. His *Farme* is the grace of God, which hee must manage by *free will*, and so fill his bagges with merites, that when God shall for heauen to sale, hee may bee able at once to buy a whole Kingdome for himselfe. But if this be all, let him take heede least of a rich *Farmer* hee become a poore beggar, and his purchase be to be turned out of doores. Let him thankfully acknowledge (the gift of God, but if he thus drawe the matter with God with termes of *purchase*, he will proue like the *Laodicians*, of whom the holy Ghost saith; [q] *Thou saist, I am rich and increased with goods, and want nothing, and knowest not how that thou art wretched and miserable, and blind, and naked.* God will haue vs [r] *to looke for eternall life not for the workes of righteousnesse which we haue done, but of his owne mercy.*

g John. 15. 5.
h Phil. 2. 13.
i Rom. 15. 18.
k *Cyprian. ad Quirin. lib. 3. ca. 5. De nullo gloriandum quando nostrum nihil est.*
l *Aug. in Ioan. tract. 5. Nemo habet de suo nisi mendacium & peccatum.*
m Esa 26. 12.
n Rom 11. 36.
o *Aug. epist. 106. Gratiam Dei & adiuuerum eius etiam ad singulos actus dari.*
p *Hieron. ad Ctesiphont. Sciamus nos nihil esse nisi quod donauit, ita nobis ipse seruiamus, &c. semper largitor, semper donator est. Non sufficit mihi quod (quia) donauit, nisi semper donauerit: Peto vt accipiam, & tum accepto orasu peto.*

q Apoc. 3. 17.

r *Bernard. in Cant. Ser. 50.*

mercy he hath saued vs, and that in giuing the reward of immortality, he crowneth not our merits but his owne gifts. As for that which he alledgeth of those that receiued the talents, and for the well vsing therof were so bountifully rewarded, it proueth that God doth well requite the good vsage of the gifts that he bestoweth vpon vs, but well he knoweth that of woorth, of merit, and deserr, there is nothing spoken there. The talent is Gods gift, and the well vsing of the talent is Gods gift, and therefore the reward commendeth the mercy of God, but can in no sort approue any merit or deserr of man. But of reward more hereafter: in the meane time *M. Bishops sensible case* is become senselesse in this case. *M. Perkins* like a Diuine, hath set downe this first condition of *merit*, and he hath answered it like a Farmer, as being more sensible to make vse of a peece of ground, then to dispute a question of the word of God. Let vs see now whether he haue any better successe against the second.

1 *Aug in Ioan. tract. 3. Quod præmiũ immortalitatis possit tribuit, coronat dona sua, non merita sua.*

4. W. BISHOP.

*The second*, That a man must do it of his owne free will and pleasure, and not of due debt: *cavieth in shew an opposition, but in deede there is no contradiction in it: for a man may and euery honest man doth of his owne free will and pleasure, pay his due debt: but let vs pardon the disorder of words, this meaning being nothing else, but that the payment of that which is otherwise due debt, cannot be any meritorius work, to which S.* Austine *doth answer in these words:* O great goodnesse of God, to whom when we did our seruice by condition of our estate, as bond-men do to their Lord, yet hath he promised again & again the reward of friends. *In which there is couched a comparison which being laid in the light will much helpe to the vnderstanding of this matter, how that hath a seruant, or bond-man, may lawfully exact of him all kind of seruice without any wages:* Bread and a whip (*saith a Philosopher*) serue for a slaue. *Now suppose the Maister to be soueraigne gouernour of a State: then if it please him to make his man free, & withall a member of his common weale, the same man by performing many good offices to the State may iustly deserue of his Prince as great reward and preferment, as anie other of his subiects: and yet may his Lord and olde Maister say truly to him, all this that thou hast done or could do, is but due debt vnto me, considering that thou wast my bond-man. So farre it with*

5 *Ser. 3. De verb. Apost.*

with vs in respect of God: all that we can do is due debt vnto him, because he hath made vs, and endowed vs with all that we either bee, or haue: yet it hath pleased him, as a most kinde Lord, to set vs at liberty through Christ, and to make vs Citizens of the Saints, and as capable of his heauenly riches, as the Angels: if we will do our indeuor to deserue them: and where as wee might haue rendred all that euer wee could do, vnto any kind of recompence: yet he of his infinitable goodnesse towards vs, doth neither bind vs to do all we can do; and yet for doing that little which he commandeth, hath by promise bound himself to repay vs large recompence: by which we may well vnderstand those words of our Sauiour: When you haue done all these things that are commanded you, say that you are vnprofitable seruants: we haue done that wee ought to do. *True.* By our native condition we were bound to perform, not only all those things that be now commanded, but whatsoeuer else it should haue pleased God to commande; and this we must of necessitie confesse, to seeme true humility in vs: yet God hath bettered our estate through Christ, and so highly aduanced vs, that we are made Citizens of the Saints, and his sonnes and heires, and that by inheritance of him aboundantly crowned, and this is S. Ambrose exposition vpon the place. S. Chrysostome pondering these words, let vs say (saith he) for a wholesome counsell for vs to say, that we be vnprofitable seruants, least pride destroy our good works: and then God will say, that we be good and faithfull seruants as it is recorded. Luke 17. Mat. 25. Vers. 21.

Againe we may truely say, when we haue done all things commanded, that we are vnprofitable seruants, as venerable Bede our most learned countryman interpreteth: because of all that we doe, no commodity accreweth vnto God our Lord in himselfe: who is such an infinite ocean of all goodnesses, that hee wanteth nothing. Wherevpon Dauid saith, That thou art my God, because thou standest in neede of no good that I can do. In Luc. 17. Psal. 15.

## R. ABBOT.

That that shall merite, must be a worke done, of a mans own *free will and pleasure, and not of due debt.* The opposition of these termes is plaine and pregnant, and *M. Bishops* instance to the contrary is absurd. A man doth willingly pay his debts, but not vpon his own free will and pleasure. For what a man doth of his owne free will

and

and pleasure, vnto his own choice to leaue it vndone if he list, but it is not at an honest mans choice to pay his debts or not to pay, but by necessary duty hee is tied to the payment thereof. There is no man but in common course of speech vnderstandeth a contradiction in those words, but *M. Rishop* cannot let a rush go by him, but he wil be seeking a knot in it, and being sicke of *Pisors* disease, albeit he know not how to speake, yet he can by no meanes hold his peace. But to shew that *the payment of that which is due debt, may bee a meritorious worke*, he alledgeth a testimony of *S. Austine*, importing no such matter. [a] *O the great goodnesse of God*, saith he, *to whom whereas by our condition and state we are of duty to do seruice, as bondmen to their Lord, and as seruants vnto God, as subiects to a potentate, and slaues to him that ransomed them, yet doth promise vnto vs the reward of friendship, that he may wast or draw from vs the duties of seruice which we owe.* All is but this, that God of his mercy by promise of reward, draweth vs on to the performance of our duty towards him. I doubt not but the Reader will wonder what should moue *M. Rishop* here to alledge this place to that purpose that he doth, and yet he needeth not wonder that seeth still his manner of idle and impertinent allegations. Very common sense teacheth that I am not bound to a man, for the doing of that which he standeth bounden to do for me. There is no merit in the doing of it, but trespasse if he do it not. Yet he telleth vs, that in *S. Austines* words there is *a comparison couched* that will put this matter out of doubt. Which in deed is so closely couched, as that in *S. Austines* words we can see no token of it, and full ilfauouredly doth he deale with *S. Austine* therein to serue his owne turne. For whereas the godly Father vseth the words to set forth Gods mercy, that he vouchsafeth to promise reward for workes of due seruice, this cosening impostour chargeth God hereby with duty of iustice bound to paiment of wages for merit and desert of workes. But in the comparison by him laid downe, there are many differences to be obserued, which do lay open vnto vs the absurdity of it. First of the infinitie disproportion betwixt God and man it ariseth, that no man by bondage or villanage can be bound in that high degree to an other man, as euery man is bound to God: and therefore though one man being by communitie of nature the same that another is, may deserue at the hands of another man, yet if followeth not therfore that a man may deserue

a *Aug. de verb. Dom. ser. 3. O magna bonitas Dei, cui cùm pro conditione obsequia reddere debeamus vtpote serui Domino, famuli Deo subiecti, potenti, mancipia redemptori, amicitiarii nobis præmia repromittit, vt à nobis obsequia debita seruitutis exigat.*

ſerue of merit at Gods hands. Secondly, manumiſſion and freedome with men extinguiſheth bondage & ſeruice, but liberty and adoption to Godward, are a bettering of the condition of our ſeruice, but no diſcharge at all of the dutie of it; nay, we are free by libertie from ſinne, from death, and from the diuell, but we continue ſtill bound & ſeruants vnto God. So doth the Apoſtle tell vs, that thereby we are made [b] *ſeruants vnto righteouſnes, ſeruants vnto God.* Therefore doth he write himſelfe [c] *the ſeruant (or boudman) of Chriſt*, and *S. Peter* teacheth vs to acknowledge our ſelues [d] *the ſeruants (or bondmen) of God.* Yea, and *S. Auſtine* in the place cited, calleth our workes [e] *duties of ſeruice (or bondage) that are owing vnto God*; which being the laſt part of the ſentence, *M. Biſhop* verie guilefully left out, becauſe it wholy ouerthroweth that which he ſaith of the changing of our former ſtate. Thirdly, the Prince is in ſome ſort tied to the ſubiect, as well as the ſubiect to the Prince. For as the ſubiect hath neede of the Prince, ſo hath the Prince alſo of the ſubiect; as the ſubiect ſtandeth by the Prince, ſo doth the Prince by the ſubiect, and therefore by neceſſity is tied to reward the ſeruice of the ſubiect, for the ſecuring of his owne eſtate. But it is not ſo with God; we do nothing to benefit him, he needeth vs not, and therefore it is his meere mercy to vouchſafe any countenance to our ſeruice. Fourthly, there is ſome proportion betwixt temporall ſeruice & temporall reward, and yet ſuch is the magnificence of Princes, as that for ſmall ſeruice they giue great reward, farre beyond the worth of the worke which they reward; but there is no proportion, as ſhall be ſhewed, betwixt our temporall ſeruice to God, and his eternall rewards to vs, and much more roiall and magnificent is he to reward farre beyond all poſſibility of deſert. Laſt of all, adde concerning *M. Biſhops* free man, that that was ſaid before concerning his farmer, that in the ſeruice of his prince hee is able to do nothing but by the helpe of his Prince, ſo that what is done, is indeede his Princes doing for him, and not his owne for himſelfe, yea and that in his Princes ſeruice he commit ſo many defaults, as that if he bee queſtioned hee bee not able for a thouſand to anſwer one, and we ſhall leaue the free man & the farmer both alike, both diſclaiming merit and pleading mercy, content to take that of free gift which *M. Biſhops* pride will not take but by deſert. Now therefore briefly to touch his application: *all the we can do*, ſaith he, *is due*

b Rom. 6. 18. 22.
c Phil. 1. 1.
d 1. Pet. 2. 16.
e *Obſequia debita ſeruituti.*

*debt*

*debt vnto God.* True, but not onely by ſtate of our creation, but alſo in *that liberty* wherewith hee hath ſet vs free in Chriſt, becauſe by our liberty wee are free from ſin and death, but ſtill continue bond to God. In this libertie he ſaith, that God hath made vs *capable of heauenly riches, if wee endeuour to deſerue them*, but no where hath God ſette them foorth with that condition, and after all our endeuour wee are verie farre from deſeruing. God, hee ſaith, *doth not bind vs to do all that we can do.* A lewd man, who cannot but know that we cannot by many degrees do that that we are bound vnto, and ſeeing hee bindeth vs to giue him [f] *all the heart, all the ſoule, all the minde, all the ſtrength*, how can he ſay that God doth *not binde vs to all that we can do?* Againe, by the ſame ſpirit hee tearmeth the commandements of God *that little that hee commandeth.* A fooliſh and ſenſeleſſe man, a meere Phariſee not knowing the power of Gods law; otherwiſe if hee had grace and ſpirit to conceiue it, hee would by the law, as the Apoſtle did, finde himſelfe [g] *dead* in himſelfe, and acknowledge that which now ſeemeth to him but little, to bee a burden beyond his ſtrength. At length hee telleth vs, that *God by promiſe hath bound himſelfe to repay vs a large recompence.* But if *by promiſe*, then of mercie on his owne part, not of merit on our part. By promiſe he bindeth himſelfe, but by merit we binde him to vs. It is in his owne power to promiſe, and without promiſe hee ſhould bee tied to nothing; but whether there bee promiſe or not, hee is tied iniuſtice to render for merit and deſert. Now becauſe Maſter *Biſhop* in the iſſue of his compariſon, canne finde nothing but promiſe, the end of his compariſon muſt bee, that merit and deſert is altogether to bee excluded. But by that that hee hath ſaid, hee telleth vs that *wee may well vnderſtand thoſe wordes of our Sauiour*, [h] *When ye haue done all thoſe things which are commanded you, ſay, Wee are vnprofitable ſeruants, we haue done that which was our dutie to doe.* And how then are wee to vnderſtand them? Marry *by our native condition wee were bound to performe all the commandements of God, and this wee muſt confeſſe to preſerue true humilitie in vs; yet God hath bettered our eſtate in Chriſt, and made vs thereby in caſe to deſerue of him.* But what, in this better ſtate are wee not ſtill bound to performe that which God commandeth? doth our high aduancement to bee the children of God, take away the obligation of our dutie towards God? If it doe

f Mat. 11. 30.

g Rom. 7. 10.

h Luk. 17. 10.

doe not ſo, (and ſurely we are ſo farre from opinion of taking it away, as that rather it doth increaſe it then what ſhall become of Maiſter *Biſhops* anſwer? We were bound before to the keeping of Gods commaundements, and we continue bound ſtill; what merit can there be more now in the doing of them, then there was before? What, Maiſter *Biſhop*, did our Sauiour meane that *by our native condition* we were to ſay, *We are vnprofitable ſeruants, we haue done but our dutie*, and did he meane that in our better condition of grace in Chriſt we are not to ſay ſo? See, gentle Reader, this is one of them who take vpon them to be the onely Maiſters of the world; and as if all learning and truth were locked vp in their Schooles. But had he not ſo much reaſon, as to conſider that Chriſt taught his Diſciples this leſſon, when they were now partakers of that better ſtate? In this betterneſſe of condition and eſtate, Chriſt teacheth them, that *when they haue done all that is commaunded, they ſhould ſay, We are vnprofitable ſeruants*, yea and by the compariſon precedent, ſetteth them foorth ſtill in condition of ſeruants vnto God, and ſheweth that they cannot of dutie expect ſo much as thankes for all that they haue done. *Doth a man thanke his ſeruant, becauſe he doth that which was commaunded him? I trow not. So likewiſe ye when ye haue done all, ſay, we are vnprofitable ſeruants, &c.* As if he ſhould ſay, Becauſe you are ſeruants, learne you to conceiue in like ſort of your ſeruice. Now Maiſter *Biſhop* hauing ſet downe that goodly commentarie, addeth, *And this is Saint* Ambroſe *his expoſition vpon the place.* But why doth he not ſet downe the words of *Ambroſe*? why doth hee ſeeke to ſteale away onely with ſetting downe his name? Let Saint *Ambroſe* himſelfe ſpeake, and hee ſaith to his purpoſe not one word, nay he ſpeaketh againſt him.[i] *Let no man reioice, ſaith he, or glorie in workes, becauſe by right we owe dutie to the Lord. Acknowledg thy ſelfe to be a ſeruant that art indebted in manifold ſeruice. Do not ſet vp thy ſelfe, for that thou art called the child of God: thou art to acknowledge grace, but not to be ignorant of nature: and doe not vaunt thy ſelfe, that thou haſt ſerued well vvhich thou waſt bound to doe.* In which words he giueth plainely to vnderſtand, that our natiue condition of ſeruice continueth ſtill, and is not

[i] *Ambroſius in Luc. lib. 8. cap. 17* Nemo in operibus gloriatur, quia iure Domino debemus obſequium. Agnoſce te eſſe ſeruum plurimis obſequijs deſeruiendum. Non te præferas quia filius Dei dicris: agnoſcenda gratia ſed non ignoranda natura: neq; te iactes ſi bene ſeruiſti quod facere debuiſti.

taken

taken away by the ſtate of the grace of God, and that we are ſtil to remember that we do but our duty; we do but what we are bound to do in all that we can do. Now further he alledgeth *Chryſoſtome*, but where is the place? We doubt him to be as falſe in *Chryſoſtome* as he was in *Ambroſe*, and yet in that which he citeth what is there for merit, or what againſt debt & duty of ſeruice vnto God? *Chryſoſtome taketh it for wholſome counſell for vs to ſay, that we be vnprofitable ſeruants, leaſt pride deſtroy our good workes.* But what? was it *Chryſoſtomes* mind that we ſhould ſay ſo and not thinke ſo? Did hee meane that by lying wee ſhould auoide pride? S. *Auſtine* well asketh the queſtion; [k] *Wilt thou then lye to ſhew humility?* S. *Bernard* hauing cited thoſe words of Chriſt, addeth thus, [l] *But thou wilt ſay that Chriſt hath taught ſo to ſay for humilities ſake? true*, ſaith he, *it was for humility indeede, but what, againſt truth?* What *Chryſoſtome* conceiued of the words, it may appeare when he ſaith: [m] *All that we do, we doe as fulfilling duty: therfore Chriſt ſaid, When ye haue done all, ſay, We are vnprofitable ſeruants, &c.* In another place he gathereth thereof, that [n] *they which haue done all, ſhall be reckoned to haue done but little*: and againe, that Chriſt thereby commandeth vs [o] *to forget our good workes*, namely as not woorth the remembrance and reckoning of, howſoeuer God in fauour & mercy doe accept them. But moſt directly he ſpeaketh to our purpoſe, where hauing ſet downe the words before alledged. [p] *No man ſheweth ſuch conuerſation of life, as that he can be worthy of the Kingdome, &c.* he addeth, *Wherefore Chriſt ſaith, When ye haue done all, ſay, We are vnprofitable ſeruants, &c.* This is it then that our Sauiour Chriſt would ſignifie in thoſe words, that a man by doing what ſoeuer he can do, cannot attaine to be worthy of the Kingdome of Chriſt, but that it is to vs altogether the gift of God. To which purpoſe *Marke* the auntient Hermite notably applieth the ſame word: [q] *Our Lord*, ſaith he, *willing to ſhew that we are debtors of the whole law, and that the adoption of children is freely giuen to vs by his bloud, ſaith, when ye haue done all things that are commanded you, ſay, we are vnprofitable ſeruants, &c. Therefore the Kingdome of heauen is not the reward (or wages) of workes, but it is the grace (or gift) of God prepared for his faithful ſeruants.* On euery ſide therefore thoſe words of Chriſt are taken to import ſomwhat againſt merit and woorth: yet *M. Biſhop* by meanes that his minion of Rome hath hoodwinked his eies, cā-

no

k *Aug. de verb. Apoſt. ſer. 25. Propter humilitatē ergo mentiru.*

l *Berna. de tripl. cuſtod. Sed hoc, inquies, propter, humilitatem mouit eſſe dicendū. Planè propter humilitatem, ſed nunquid cōtra veritatem?*

m *Chryſoſt. ad pop. Antioch. hom. 53. Omnia quæ facimus, agimus debitum implentes. Propterea & ipſa dicebat, &c.*

n *Idem de pœnitent. Qui omnia faciunt, parua feciſſe computabuntur.*

o *Idē de pœnit. & confeſſ. Obliuioni tradere bona opera.*

p *Chryſoſt. ad Coloſſ. hom. 2. Supra. ſect. 2.*

q *Marc. Heremit. li. de his qui ſe putant operib. iuſtificari. Deminus totius legis debitores nos eſſe indicari volens, & filiorū adoptionem proprio ſanguine nobis gratuitò datum, inquit, Cum omnia feceritis, &c. Propterea regnum cœlorū non eſt merces operū ſed gratia Domini fidelibus ſeruis præparata.*

not see so much, but he is still doting vpon that which he can nowhere finde. Which the more plainely to shew, he citeth *Beda* for another construction of these words of Christ, that therefore we are to account our selues *vnprofitable seruants, because of all that we do, there ariseth no profit to God*; but why did he leaue out that which *Beda* there addeth, as giuing to vnderstand that that former was not the whole meaning of Christs words; *We are vnprofitable seruants, because the sufferings of this time, are not worthy of the glory to come, as in another place, which crowneth thee in mercy and compassion. He saith not, in thy merits, because by whose mercy we are preuented that we may humbly serue him, by his gift we are crowned to reigne with him?* What *M. Bishop*, no more faith, no more trust in you? do you alledge Authors, when they condemne your doctrine, euen in the places whence you cite them? Leaue off, leaue off, *it is hard for you to kicke against the prickes.* You fight against the Gospell of Christ, against the truth of God, and do not you doubt but it will preuaile against you, and the conqueft thereof shall be your vtter confusion if you hold on your course.

r Beda in Luc. cap. 17.

Act. 26. 14.

## 5. W. Bishop.

*And thus we fall vpon the third property of* M. Perkins *meritorious worke, which is,* That it bee done to the profit of another: *and say that albeit God in himselfe receiue no profit by our workes, yet doth he in the administration of his holy common-weale the Church, wherein good mens services do much pleasure him. And in this sence it is said of* S. Paul, That by cleansing our selues from wicked workes, we shall become vessels sanctified, and profitable vnto our Lord. *Againe,* God is glorified by our good workes. That seeing our good workes, they may glorifie your Father which is in heauen. *Finally,* God doth reioyce at the recouerie of his lost children. *If then good men trauailing painfully in Gods Vineyard, do yeeld him outward by both honour, ioy, and commoditie; that may suffice to make their worke meritorius.*

2. Tim. 2. Math. 5.

Ioh. 15. ver. 8. Luke. 15.

## R. Abbot.

As touching this condition, we contend not with Maister *Bishop* concerning his exposition thereof. *Merit* must be done by the

will, and for the vse and behoofe of him at whose hands it must merit. So Christes obedience by the will of the Father, to the praise of the glory of his grace, did merit & deserue at his Fathers hands in our behalfe. Onely it is to be added, that it must fully satisfie the vse and behoofe whereto it is intended, and not faile in any point thereof. Now because [a] *the children of God are so moued by the spirit of God, as that by their owne spirit as the sonnes of men through humaine motions and affections, they sometimes faile and fall backe to themselues*, and therefore do not so entirely and perfectly serue the vses of the Lord, to yeeld either glory to God, or loue to their brethren as they ought to do, therefore neither do they attaine to this condition of merit, nor can in any sort bind God to repay them for that broken seruice that they haue done, nay if he would call matters to strict reckoning and account, he hath rather occasion of quarell against them, for disgracing and defiling the works that he hath wrought in them.

a *Aug. Enchirid. cap. 64. Sic spiritu Dei excitantur vt etiam spiritu suo, &c. tanquam filij hominum quibusdam motibus humanis deficiant ad seipsos, &c.*

## 6. W. Bishop.

M. Perkins *fourth property is*, That the worke and reward be equall in proportion: *If he vnderstand Arithmeticall proportion, that is, that they be equall in quantity, to wit, the one to be as great, or of as long continuance as the other: then we denie this kinde of equality to be requisite to merit: there is another sort of proportion, called by the Philosopher 5. Ethic. Geometricall: and the equality of that is taken by a reasonable correspondence of the one vnto the other: as when a good office is giuen vnto a Citizen of desart, it may be that the honour and commodity of the office is farre greater, then was the merit of the man: yet he being as well able to discharge it as an other, and hauing better deserued it, is holden in true iustice worthie of it: In like manner in a game where maisteries are tried, the prize is giuen vnto him that doth best, not because the value of the reward is iust as much woorth, as that act of the man who winneth it: but for that such actiuitie is esteemed woorthy of such a recompence. Now the crowne of heauenly glory, is likened by Saint* Paule, *vnto a Garland in a game: where he saith*, That we all runne, but one carieth away the prize. *And*, he that striueth for the maisterie, is not crowned, vnlesse he

1. Cor. 9. 2. Tim. 2.

striue

thriue lawfully. *It is alſo reſembled vnto places of honor:* I will place thee ouer much. *And,* I goe to prouide you places. Mat.25. Ioh.14.

*Grace is alſo in many places of Scripture compared to ſeede:* For the ſeede of God tarieth in him. *But a little ſeede caſt into good ground, and well manured, bringeth foorth abundance of corne. Briefly, then ſuch equality as there is betweene the well deſerning ſubiect and the office, betweene him that ſtriueth lawfully and the crowne, betweene the ſeede and the corne, is betweene the reward of heauen, and the merit of a true ſeruant of God.* Mat.13. 1. Joh. 3.

*And thus much of* M. Perkins *firſt Argument, more indeede to explicate the nature and condition of merit, then that his reaſon nakedly propoſed, did require it.*

## R. Abbot.

The proportion that maketh *merit or deſert,* muſt be *Arithmeticall,* wherein the worke muſt fully equall the reward, though not in greatneſſe and continuance, yet in value and worth. Jf the one in that ſort do not counterpoiſe the other, the one cannot bee ſaid to bee deſerued by the other. But there is no proportion at all either Arithmeticall or Geometricall, betwixt that that is finite and that that is infinite; therefore none at all betwixt the worke of man and the reward of heauen, the one being euerie way finite, the other in continuance infinite. So then Maſter *Biſhops* Geometricall proportion and *reaſonable correſpondence* is excluded alſo, becauſe [a] *the grace (or gift) of Gods reward,* as *Fulgentius* ſaith, *doth ſo much there abound, as that incomparably & vnſpeakeably it exceedeth all the merit of the will and worke of man, albeit it bee good and giuen vnto him of God.* There is no *reaſonable correſpondence* where the one incomparably and vnſpeakeably exceedeth all the merit and deſert of the other. The ſame is imported by Saint *Bernard,* who hauing ſaid, that *mens merits are not ſuch as that life eternall is due vnto thē of right,* giueth reaſon thereof, beſide that that I mentioned before: [b] *For what are al merits to ſo great glory? M. Biſhop* wil haue vs think that he did amiſſe to aske ſuch a queſtiō, becauſe there is as he ſaith ſuch *a reaſonable correſpōdence* betwixt the one & the other, as that the one cōtrary to *S. Bernards* ſentence, is iuſtly & duly deſerued by the other. And in the ſame ſort doth he cōtrol *Macarius,*

a *Fulgent. ad Monim. lib. 1 Tantum ibi gratia diuina retributionis exuberat vt incomparabiliter atque ineffabiliter omne meritum quamuis bonæ & ex Deo datæ humanæ voluntatis & operationis excedat.*

b *Bern. in Annunciat. Ser. 1. Quid ſunt omnia merita ad tantam gloriam?*

who affirmeth, that [c] *though a man from the time that* Adam *was created euen to the end of the world, were in warfare against the diuell, and did suffer all afflictions and sorowes, yet should he do no great matter in comparison to the glory which he shall receiue, being to reigne with Christ world without end.* Now thē because all *reasonable correspondence* is quite sunke, Maister *Bishops* merit is quite drowned, and his deuice of *Geometrical proportion* will not serue his turne. But we are here to note the notable stupiditie of this merit-monger Pharisee, who maketh the like correspondence betwixt the merit of man and the reward of heauen, as is *betwixt the well deseruing subiect, and an office bestowed on him, betwixt him that striueth lawfully and the crowne; betwixt the seede and the corne increasing thereof.* Who would thinke that he could be so absurd, so basely to proportion those [d] *good things which neither eie hath seene nor eare hath heard, nor haue entred into mans heart, which God hath prepared for them that loue him?* And yet euen in these comparisons how farre is he beside the stoole? For first we know that subiects do not challenge offices at their Princes hands, by right and title of merit and desert, but by request of fauour and grace. Whatsoeuer a man hath done, he hath done the duty of a subiect, and it is at the discretion and pleasure of the Prince, to consider of that he hath done; and what is it to him, if his Prince bestow the office which he desireth, vpon a man of meaner quality and woorth then he thinketh himselfe to be? But if the honour and commodity of the office be farre greater, as *M. Bishop* saith, thē the merit of the man, shall we not think that he meriteth a dagger & a bell, that will go about hereby to approue a title of merit and desert with God? For if the reward of heauen be farre greater then the merit of man, why doth he seeke to make good our meriting thereof? As touching his second comparison of *games & triall of maisteries*, he might easily conceiue, that the prize *ex condicto* stādeth good to him that winneth it, but there is no question of the value or woorth of it, which haply is much lesse then to counteruaile the labour and paines that is bestowed for the gaining of it. As in the *games of Olympus*, the most famous that euer were in the world, the prize was but an *Oliue garland*, nothing for worth in cōparison of the pains & expence mē were at, to prepare thēselues, & to trauel for the obtaining thereof: so that *Tigranes* whē *Mardonius* had perswaded *Zerxes* to

[c] *Macar. homil. 15. Si quis ab eo tempore quo cōditus est Adam vsque ad finē mūdi mili. asset cōtra diabolum & omnes dolores cruciatusq; pertul. sset, nihil magnum feciss et respectu gloriæ quā consecuturus est, & in qua infinitis seculis cū Christo regnabit.*

[d] 1. Cor. 2. 9.

to warre against the Grecians; hearing thereof said vnto him. *Good Lord*, Mardonius, *what kinde of men hast thou brought vs to fight against, who trie masteries not for gaining of money, but for shewing of prowesse and valour?* So that the correspondence betwixt the gamester and the prize may be this, that the labour and paines on the one side is much, and the prize on the other side worth iust nothing, nor is esteemed at all for the value and worth of it, and yet hereby forsooth Maister *Bishop* will set forth vnto vs a correspondence betwixt the merit of our workes, and the reward of heauen. As for the places of Scripture that hee citeth hereof, the Apostle thereby setteth foorth the consequence and order of the worke and the reward, God hauing designed the one to the other, as the prize is proposed in the game, but as touching value and worth, as touching merit and desert he intendeth nothing therein. His third comparison is, that the grace of God is compared to seede, as where Saint *Iohn* saith: [f] *his seede remaineth in him.* In which place Saint *Iohn* hauing said, that *hee that is borne of God sinneth not*, that is, finally and vtterly, giueth reason thereof: for that being once borne of God, though he do greeuously fall, as did *Dauid* and *Peter*, and many other, yet there is still a *seede remaining in him*, which albeit for the time it seeme couered and dead, yet shall reuiue and spring againe, and bring forth fruit vnto God: and what is this to *M. Bishops* merit? He telleth vs, that by *seede* is imported *the grace of God*, but hee doth not shew vs, that by *seede* is imported the merit of man. To what end then is this brought in, but to let vs see that his head is idle, and doth not well aduise what he hath to say? Well, wee must conceiue his meaning by that hee saith, that *a little seede bringeth forth abundance of corne.* But wee must aske him whether there be that *reasonable correspondence* betwixt the seed and the increase, as that the one in worth should bee esteemed with the other? If *M Bishop* should offer that correspondence to the husbandman for his crop, would hee not iudge him with his *Geometricall proportion* to bee scarcely correspondent to a wise man? Shall we then think him wel in his wits, that thinketh the seed of his merits to be a valuable consideration for the receiuing of the crop of heauenly rewards? Again, the husbandmans increase of his seed whence proceedeth it? Doth he by sowing his seed, expect it as a matter of merit & desert? Is it not wholy the blessing of God

[c] Polyb. Virgil. de inuent. rerum lib. 2. ca. 13.

[f] 1. Iohn. 3. 9.

that ſendeth the early and latter raine, and giueth ſtrength to the earth to bring forth increaſe thereof: Euen ſo is it in all the reward that God beſtoweth vpon vs. We ſow the ſeed of our good workes, but of thēſelues they yeeld vs no fruit; there is no worth or merit in them to require wages at Gods hands, but it is only the mercy and bounty of God whereby we ſhall reape the increaſe that wee expect thereof. Thus *M. Biſhop* can find no meanes to thriue. Hee hath bene a farmer, and a free-man, and an officer, and a gameſter, and a ſeedeman, and yet euery where he is croſſed in his *merit*, and can no where light vpon a foundation to ſet it firme and ſure. And yet marke, gentle Reader, how with his *reaſonable correſpondence* he minceth the matter, ouer that other his fellowes do. The Rhemiſts ſpeake plaine Engliſh, as wee haue heard before, and tell vs that their works are *truely and properly meritorious*, and not onely *reaſonably*, but *fully worthy of euerlaſting life*, that *they haue a right to heauen and deſerue it worthily*, and that *God by his iuſtice oweth it vnto them*. Theſe are downe-right lads, that ſticke not to vtter their mindes, but *M. Biſhop* he commeth in paltring with his Geometricall proportion, and reaſonable correſpondence, and like a young nouice is abaſhed to ſay all, and by that meanes if good heede be not taken, is likely to marre the market of merit, to the harme of himſelfe and the reſt of them. Hitherto then it appeareth, that *M. Perkins* did rightly aſſigne thoſe foure conditions or circumſtances to be required in a meritorious work? which ſtanding good as they do, there can be no merit; becauſe al the good that we do is Gods, becauſe in all we do but our duty, becauſe that that we do doth not fully ſatisfie our duty, nor hath any due proportion or correſpondence to the reward of heauen.

## 7. W. Biſhop.

Exod. 20. *His ſecond teſtimony is*, God will ſhew mercy vpon thouſands, in them that loue him and keepe his commandements. *Hence he reaſoneth thus*: Where reward is giuen vpon mercy, there is no merit: but reward is giuen vpon mercy, as the text proueth, *ergo*.

Anſwere. *That in that text is nothing, touching the reward of heauen which is now in queſtion: God doth for his louing ſeruants ſake, ſhew mercy vnto their children or friends, either in temporall things,*

*things, or in calling them to repentance, and such like: but doth neuer for mans sake, bestow the kingdom vpon another, vnlesse the party himselfe be first made worthy of it.*

*That confirmation of his, that* Adam *by his continuall and perfect obedience, could not haue procured a further increase of Gods fauor, is both besides the purpose, and most false: for as well he, as euery good man else, by good vse of Gods gifts, might day by day increase them: And that no man thinke that in Paradise it should haue beene otherwise,* S. Augustine *saith expresly,* That in the felicity of Paradise, righteousnes preserued, should haue ascended into better. *And* Adam *finally and all his posterity (if he had not fallen) should haue bin from Paradise translated aliue into the Kingdome of heauen: this by the way.* *In Enchir. cap. 25*

## R. Abbot.

What, when God promiseth *mercy to thousands in them that loue him and keepe his commandements*, doth he meane his mercy to their children only, and not to themselues? and is the mercy that is promised only for earth, and not for heauen? Here *M. Bishop* as it appeareth, was hardly bestead, when he could find no way to get out, but by such a senseleſſe and absurd shift. But to take away that corrupt glose of his, the Prophet *Dauid* expresly referreth al reward to Gods mercy. [a] *Thou O Lord art mercifull*, or *mercy O Lord is to bee ascribed vnto thee, for thou rewardest euery man according to his work.* Which words are generall of euery man, not signifying that which God doth to some for others sake, but that which euery man receiueth for his owne worke, and import not onely reward of temporall things, because they are the words which the Scripture euery where vseth to signifie the reward that shall be giuen at that day. Now then there is no merit either in things temporall or eternall, because it is of *mercy* that God rewardeth euery man according to his workes. And thus of Gods eternall mercy, the same Prophet alluding to the words of the commaundement, saith in another place: [b] *The mercy of the Lord is for euer and euer vpon them that feare him, and his righteousnesse towards their childrens children, euen such as keepe his couenant, and thinke vpon his commaundements to do them.* Lo is Gods mercy then whereby to them that feare him and keepe his commandements, hee giueth reward for euer and euer. [a] Psal 62.12. [b] Psal.103.17.

shewing himselfe iust also in performance of the same promise of his mercy to their childrens children. But could not the blind man here see, how by his owne answer hee doth circumuent himselfe? The place he saith must be vnderstood of *temporall graces and benefits*, not of the reward of heauen. So then by mercy God bestoweth the reward of temporall benefits, but by merit hee bestoweth the Kingdome of heauen. Now how strange a thing is it and improbable, that merits should extend to the purchase of the Kingdome of heauen, and yet should not serue to purchase temporal benefits here vpon the earth? [c] *If glasse bee of so great price, how much more worth is a most pretious iewell?* If earth bee so much worth, as that mercy onely can yeeld it, shall we thinke that we haue merit to deserue heauen? But we will leaue the man to his folly: it may be when he hath better considered of the matter, we shall haue of him some wiser answer. In the meane time we acknowledge, that God doth not for one mans sake bestow the Kingdome of heauen vpon another, but yet of mercy he bestoweth it both vpon the one and vpon the other, both vpon the Fathers and vpon the children, euen all that feare him and keepe his commandements. And sith of mercy he bestoweth it, certaine it is that they haue no merit to deserue and chalenge it, whosoeuer they be that loue him and keepe his commandements. That which hee saith of *Adam*, hee saith it without booke, and hath no warrant for that hee saith. As for the place of *Austine*, though it containe nothing but what is probable, yet we answer to it by a rule which the same *S. Austine* hath prescribed otherwhere, that [d] *where there is controuersie of a very obscure matter, there being no certain & clear instructions of holy Scriptures to help vs therein, humane presumption is to stay it selfe, doing nothing by inclining either way.*

c *Hieron. Si tanti vitrum, quanti pretiosissimum margaritum?*

d *Aug. de peccat. mer. & remiss. lib. 2. ca. 36. Vbi de re obscurissima disputatur, non adiuuantibus diuinarum scripturarum certis clarisq; documentis, cohibere se debet humana præsumptio, nihil faciens in alteram partem declinãdo.*

8. W. BISHOP.

*Now to the third Argument.*

Rom 6. Scripture condemneth merit of works: The wages of sinne is death. *True. But wee speake of good workes, and not of bad, which the Apostle calleth sinne: where were the mans wits? but it followeth there,* That eternall life is the grace or gift of God. *This is to purpose: but answered 1200. yeares past, by that famous Father Saint* Augustine,

in

*in diuers places of his most learned Workes. I will note one or two of them.*

*First, thus here ariseth no small doubt, which by Gods helpe I will* De grat. & lib. arb. cap. 8. *now dissolue. For if eternall life be rendred vnto good workes, as the holy Scripture doth most clearly teach, (note) how the can it be called grace: when grace is giuen freely, and not repayed for workes: and so pursuing the points of difficulty at large in the end resolueth: that eternall life is most truly rendred vnto good workes, as the due reward of them: but because those good workes could not haue been done, vnlesse God had before freely through Christ, bestowed his grace vpon vs, therefore the same eternall life, is also truly called grace: because the first roote of it was Gods free gift.*

*The very same answer doth he giue, where he hath these words:* Eternall life is called grace, not because it is not rendred vnto merits, but for that those merits to which it is rendred were giuen, *in which place he ouerthrowes Mr. Perkins proportion most directly, affirming, that S. Paule might haue said truly, eternall life is the pay or wages of good workes: but to hold vs in humility partly, and partly to put a difference betweene our saluation and damnation, chose rather to say that the gift of God was life eternall: because of our damnation, we are the whole and onely cause, but not of our saluation, but principally the grace of God, the onely fountaine of merit, and all good workes.* Epist. 106.

## R. Abbot.

*Mr Perkins* alledged the whole words of the Apostle, not to argue onely from the assertion expressed in the latter part, that *eternall life is the gift of God*, but also from the connexion of the whole sentence, that whereas it being said, that *the wages of sinne is death*, the sequele of the speech, if there were any merit in our workes, should haue bene, *The wages of righteousnesse is eternall life*, he saith not so, but *the gift of God is eternall life*: and so both by that which he doth not say, and also by that which he doth say, sheweth, that there is no place to be giuen to the merit and desert of man. Now *Maister Bishop* taketh the first part of the sentence by it selfe, *The wages of sinne is death*, as if *Maister Perkins* had thence argued against merit, and asketh, *where were the wages?* Surely his owne wits were not so farre from home, but that a Rom. 6. 23.

he

he well knew wherein the proose stood, but we see hee is disposed sometimes to shew his apish trickes, that we may see how hee can skippe and leape about the chaine, how soeuer he aduantage himselfe nothing at all thereby. But at his pleasure hee produceth the words which *M. Perkins* properly intended, *Eternall life is the gift of God through Iesus Christ our Lord.* Hee telleth vs, that the place is answered 1200 yeares past by *S. Austin in diuers places of his works.* Now indeed it is true, that *S. Austine* in diuers places of his works hath handled those words, but the spite is, that in none of all those places he hath said any thing to serue *M. Bishop* for an answer. This may appeare by that that he saith in the very same booke, and very next Chapter to that that *M. Bishop* citeth: [b] *Whereas the Apostle might say, and rightly say, The wages of righteousnesse is eternall life, yet he chose rather to say, The grace of God is eternall life, that we may vnderstand, that not for our merites, but for his owne mercies sake, he bringeth vs to eternall life, whereof it is said in the Psalme, He crowneth thee in mercy and compassion.* Hereby it may seeme, that *S. Austine* meant to yeeld *M. Bishop* small helpe by his expounding of this place to the maintenance of their merits. But in the chapter cited by *M. Bishop*, he propoundeth the question [c] *how eternal life should be called the grace of God*, seeing that it is elsewhere said, that *God will render vnto euery man according to his workes.* The difficulty he sheweth to arise of this, that *that is called grace which is not rendred vnto workes, but is freely giuen.* Whereto he citeth the words of the Apostle: *If it be of grace it is not of works; otherwise grace is no grace.* Then hee soluеth the question thus, that [d] *we must vnderstand that our good workes, to which eternall life is rendred, do belong also to the grace of God*, signifying that God of his mercy intending to giue vs eternall life, doth by the same mercy giue vs those good workes to which he will giue it. For conclusion of that Chapter, he saith consequently, that [e] *because our good life is nothing else but the grace of God, therefore vndoubtedly eternall life, which is rendred vnto good life is the grace of God: for that is freely giuen, because that is freely giuen to which it is giuen. But good life to which eternall life is giuen, is onely grace; eternall life which is giuen to good life, because it is the reward thereof, is grace for grace, as it were a reward for righteousnesse, that is not hee saith, as it is true, that God will render to euery man according to his workes.* In all which discourse plainely hee sheweth,

that

b *Aug. de grat. & lib. arbit. cap. 9. Cùm posset dicere & recte dicere, Stipendium iustitia vita æterna, maluit tamen dicere, Gratia Dei &c. vt intelligamus non pro meritis nostris Deum nos ad vitã æternam sed pro misericordione suaperducere, de quo, &c.*

c *Ibid. cap. 8. Si vita æterna bonis operibus redditur sicut apertissimè dicit Scriptura, Quoniam Deus reddet, &c. quomodo gratia est vita æterna, cùm gratia non operibus redditur, sed gratis detur, &c.*

d *Intelligamus & ipsa bona opera nostra quibus æterna redditur vita ad Dei gratiam pertinere.*

e *Vita nostra bona nihil aliud est quã Dei gratia: sine dubio & vita æterna quia bona vitæ redditur Dei gratia est: & ipse enim gratis data est, quia gratis data est illa cui datur, sed illacui datur tantummodo gratis est; hæc autem quæ illi datur quoniam præmiũ eius est, gratia est pro gratia, tanquã merces pro iustitia si verum sit, &c.*

that good life is the grace & gift of God, and when God rendreth thereto eternall life, he doth but adde one grace to another grace, which although it be *as it were a reward for righteousnes*, yet is indeed but *grace for grace*. Which fully accordeth with that that was cited out of him before, that *f What soever God promised, he promised to men vnworthy, that it might not be promised as vnrewarded works, but being grace, might according to the name be freely giue, because to the iustly, so far as a man can liue iustly, is not a matter of mans merit, but of the gift of God.* So that although eternall life be *as it were a reward of righteousnesse* in consequence and order, yet absolutely to speake it is not so, because both the one and the other are only the grace and gift of God. Now if God by his free gift intending to vs eternall life, do giue vs his grace to leade a iust and holy life, that thereto he may giue it, haue we reason hereupon with *M. Bishop*, of mercie whereby we should glorifie God, to build vp merit and deceit for the glorifying of our selues? for shal we rather subscribe to that which *S. Austine* saith for conclusion of that whole disputation concerning that place of the Apostle, as before I cited, that *it is not for our merits that God bringeth vs to eternal life, but for his own mercies sake*. The other place cited by *M. Bishop* is wholly to the same effect. *g When God crowneth our merits, he crowneth nothing else but his owne gifts. For as from the beginning we obtained mercy to be faithful, so in the end he shall crowne vs in compassion and mercy. Whence eternal life is called grace for no other cause, but because it is freely giuen, not for that it is not rendred to merits, but for that the merits themselues are giuen to which it is giuen.* In which there is nothing that giueth any shew of fauour to *M. Bishop* but the very name of merits, but that that helpeth him nothing shall appeare hereafter, *S. Austine* meaning thereby meerly good workes, without any conceipt of merit as it is now vnderstood in the Church of Rome. Yea and that appeareth plainely here also: for if God in crowning merits, crowne nothing but his owne gifts, then those merits are not truly and properly so called, because a man cannot properly merit at Gods hands by that that is to him nothing else but the gift of God. And this *S. Austin* sheweth further in that that foloweth: *h It is true righteousnes*

f *Supra sect. 2. Augustin. in Psal. 109.*

g *Idem Epist. 105. Cùm deus coronat merita nostra, nihil aliud coronat quàm munera sua. sicut enim ab initio fidei misericordiam consecuti sumus, non quia fideles eramus, sed vt essemus, sic in fine coronabit nos in misericordia & misericordia. Vnde & vita ipsa aeterna gratia nuncupatur, non ob aliud nisi quia gratis datur, nec datur quia merita nostra dantur, sed quia data sunt & ipsa merita quibus datur.*

h *Iustitia datur vita aeterna vera iustitia est. Si autem vera iustitia est ex te non est: desinit esse iustitia quidam stipendium. si ex te tibi esset iustitia esset, descendens à Patre luminum, &c. Quapropter si homo, si acceptaturus es vitam aeternam, iustitiae quidam stipendium. est, sed tibi gratia est, cui gratia est & ipsa iustitia. Tibi enim tanquam debita redderetur, si ex te tibi esset iustitia cui debitur. Nunc ergo, &c. vt supra Sect. 3.*

to.

*to which eternall life is due. But if it be true, it is not of thy selfe, it is from aboue, descending frō the Father of lights: that thou mightst haue it, if at least thou hast it, verily thou hast receiued it. For what hast thou that thou hast not receiued? Wherefore ô man, if thou be to receiue eternall life, it is indeed the wages of righteousnes, but to thee it is grace to whom righteousnesse it selfe also is grace. It should be rendered as due vnto thee, if of thy selfe thou hadst the righteousnesse to which it is due. Now therefore of his fulnes we receiue not only grace, &c. but also grace for grace, &c.* If eternall life be merited and deserued by vs, then to vs it is the wages of righteousnesse; then it is rendred as due vnto vs. But *S. Austine* though he confesseth, that it may be said, that it is the wages of righteousnesse, yet denieth it to be so to vs: and denieth that it is rendred as due vnto vs. Therefore it must necessarily be granted, that it is not merited and deserued by vs: it can no way be auoided, but that if it be deserued by vs, it is due vnto vs: but it is not due vnto vs, saith *S. Austine*, because the righteousnesse is none of ours. There is therefore on our behalfe no merit, no desert to which it should be accounted due. Thus *S. Austine* wholly bendeth himselfe to establish the truth of the grace of God, against the Pelagian hereticks, and saith nothing whereof *M. Bishop* may inferre the doctrine of merit, which he together with them maintaineth against the grace of God. But for the further declaring of *S. Austines* mind, I will obserue that one sentence of his vpon the Psalmes: [i] *To thee being a sinner is granted forgiuenes, the spirit of iustification is giuen thee: there is giuen thee charitie and loue, whereby to do all good things: and beyond all these things, he will giue thee also eternall life, and the societie of the Angels, all of mercy. Do not talke of thy merits any where, because euen thy merits also are his gifts.* In which words it plainely appeareth, that albeit *S. Austine* vseth the name of merit, according to the language of his time, yet he did it not in any such sense, but as still intending, that both in the beginning, and in the proceeding and in the end all is wholly and onely to be ascribed vnto Gods mercie. But *M. Bishop* telleth vs heere that *S. Austine* crosseth *M. Perkins* proportion, in that he affirmeth, that *S. Paul* might haue said, that eternall life is the wages of good workes. Wherein he doth but deceiue himselfe: because to speake simply it is true, that eternall life is the stipend and wages of true and perfect righteousnesse, according to the sentence of the law: [k] *He that doth*

i *Aug. in Psal. 144. Data est venia peccatori, datus spiritus iustificationis, data est charitas & dilectio, in qua omnia bona faciat, & super hæc dabit & vitam æternā & societatem Angelorum: totā dominicā dis. Meritā tua misquam iactes, quia & ipsa tua merita aliunde dona sunt.*

k Gal. 3. 12.

*doth these things shall liue in them*; and yet it is so but onely *by couenant and condition*, not by merit, because in doing all we should do but that that we are bound to do. But as hath been already said, *S. Austin*, though he graunt that simply it might haue bene so tearmed, yet denieth it to be so to vs. *It is indeed the stipend or wages of righteousnesse, but to thee it is grace*, that is, to thee it is no stipend. Now this is spoken vpon a supposall of entire and perfect righteousnesse; but take withall the exceptions that *S. Austine* putteth in by the way, as we haue seene: [l] *if at least thou haue it*; and againe, [m] *so farre as a man can liue iustly*. And let it be considered herewith, which out of *Austin* hath bene abundantly declared in the former question, that there is no righteousnesse so perfect in this life, as that therby vve can be found iust in the sight of God, and then merit and stipend shall be excluded, not onely for that our righteousnesse is the gift of God, but also for that we haue not that righteousnesse to which the stipend and wages of rightousnesse should be due. But let vs here consider the reasons which *M. Bishop* setteth downe in *S. Austines* name, why he did not say, *The wages of righteousnesse is eternall life partly*, saith he, *to hold vs in humility*. Well, but yet it was not *S. Austines* meaning, that the Apostle wold keepe vs in humility by cõcealing that that is true, but by withholding vs from conceiuing proudly of our selues that that is not true: [n] *lest* (saith *S. Austin*) *righteousnesse should aduance it selfe as of any merit that man should haue thereby*. Againe, *partly* (saith he) *to put difference betweene saluation & damnation*. This reason he maketh of his owne, *S. Austin* hath it not: but what is that difference? Obserue it well, gentle Reader, for herein is the secret, and thou shalt see the lewdnesse of these wretched men in abusing the name of S. *Austin* to the colouring of their falshood. *We are* (forsooth) *the whole and only cause of our damnation, but not of our saluation, but principally the grace of God*. The grace of God he saith is *principally* the cause of our saluation, but not *the whole and onely cause*: for we must vnderstand, that we our selues by our *Free will* are a part of the cause of our saluation. Yea vpon *Free will* they hang the effect of the grace of God, & from thence do they deriue vnto man that merit wherby he doth deserue eternall life. For they know well, that man cannot be said to merit any thing by that that is wholy the gift of God and therefore for the vpholding of merit and desert, they are so eager

[l] *Si tamen habes.* *Epist* 105.

[m] *In quantum homo potest iustè viuere.* In Psal. 109.

[n] *Ne iustitia de humanæ se extolleret bono merito.*

eager and earneſt for the maintenance of *free will*. They walke in this behalfe in the verie ſteppes of the Pelagian heretikes, who as *Proſper* recordeth, alledged for defenſe of *Free will*, [o] that *men can haue no commendation nor merit, who are faithfull by the gift of grace.* So *S. Hierome* bringeth in the Heretike ſaying reſolutely: [p] *No man ſhall take away from me free will, leſt if God bee my helper in my workes the reward be not due to mee, but to him that worketh in mee.* Euen ſo Popiſh merit ſtandeth vpon *free will:* for [q] *men*, ſay the Rhemiſts, *worke by their owne Free will, and thereby deſerue their ſaluation.* So ſaith, *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, [r] *In that we by free will conſent to Gods monition, who yet had it in our power to diſſent, a reward and wages is due vnto vs, and hence is our merit.* In like ſort *Andradius* telleth vs, that [s] *they are called our merits, becauſe we freely & voluntarily vndertake thoſe actions whereby wee merit with God.* Now of this poiſonfull doctrine whereby man is made partaker with God in the glorie of our ſaluation, they would make *S. Auſtine* a partaker and patron with them, who in condemning the Pelagian hereſie, condemned the ſame, and challengeth our good workes which he calleth merits, wholly and only vnto God. So he ſaith, that [t] *all our good worke or merit is wrought vnto vs by grace onely*, that [u] *all the merit of the iuſt through the whole life of this world is grace.* [x] *That then art iuſt*, ſaith he, *repute it wholly to mercy.* [y] *That that we are and haue in goodneſſe, we haue it wholly of him.* To that purpoſe he alledgeth againſt the Pelagians a ſpeech of *Cyprians*, requiring that [z] *no man proudly & arrogantly aſſume any thing to himſelfe, nor call the glory of confeſſing or ſuffering his own, that whileſt humble and lowly confeſſion goeth before, and all wholly is yeelded vnto God, it may be granted vnto vs by his mercy, whatſoeuer wee humbly requeſt in the feare of God.* Now according to thoſe words of *yeelding or attributing all wholly vnto God*, he ſaith in the ſame place, [a] *We liue more ſafely if we attribute all wholly to God, and doe not commit our ſelues partly to God and partly to our ſelues.* For reaſon whereof hee ſaith anon after, that [b] *after the fall of man, God would not haue it belong to any thing but to*

o *Proſper. de lib. arbit. Aſſerunt nec laudem habere eos, nec meritum quos ex dono gratiæ ſuos fideles.*

p *Hieron. aduer. Pelag. Mihi nullus auferre poterit arbitrij libertatẽ, me ſi in operibus meis Deus adiutor extiterit non mihi debeatur merces ſed ei qui in me operatus eſt.*

q *Rhemiſ. Annot. in Rom. 9. 14.*

r *Alphonſ. de Caſtro adu. hæres. lib. 7. tit Gratia. Ex hoc quòd nos monitioni illius conſentimus, qui tamen diſſentire poteramus, debetur nobis merces & præmium, & inde meritum noſtrum.*

s *Andrad. Orth. explicat. lib. 6. Noſtra merita dicuntur quia liberè & ſponte illas actiones ſuſcipimus, quibus apud Deum promereamur.*

t *Aug. Epiſt. 105. Omne bonum meritum noſtrum non in nobis facit niſi gratia.*

u *Idem. Hypog. lib. 3. Iuſtorum per totam ſeculi vitam meritum omne eſt gratia.*

x *De ver. Dom. Serm. 7. Totum repute quòd iuſtus es pietati.* y *De verb. Apoſt. Serm. 16. Totum quòd ſumus & quòd habemus boni abillo habemus.* z *Idem de bono perſeu. cap. 6. ex Cypriano de Orat. Dom. Neque ſibi ſuperbè arrogant erque aliquid aſſumat, nequis aut confeſſionis aut paſſionis gloriam ſuam dicat, &c. vt dum precedit humilis & ſubmiſſa confeſſio, & datur totum Deo quicquid ſuppliciter cum Dei timore petitur, ipſius pietate præſtetur.* a *Ibid. Tutiores viuimus ſi totum Deo damus, & non nos illi ex parte, & nobis ex parte committimus.* b *Ibid. cap. 7. Poſt caſum hominis non niſi ad gratiam ſuam Deus pertinere voluit, vt homo accedat ad eum; neque niſi ad gratiam ſuam pertinere voluit, vt homo non recedat ab eo.*

his

*his grace that we come vnto him, nor would haue it to belong to any thing but his grace, that we do not depart from him.* And to those words of *Cyprian* he alludeth in diuers and sundry places, as namely, where he saith, that [c] *therefore the Apostle saith, It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercie, that all wholy may be attributed vnto God*, discoursing at large, that our willing & our running is not to be diuided betwixt the will of man and the mercie of God, because then as it is said on the one side, *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercie*, because the will of man alone suffiseth not, so on the other side it may be said, It is not of God that sheweth mercie, but of him that willeth and him that runneth, because the mercie of God alone sufficeth not. Now it were wickednesse thus to crosse and contradict the Apostles words, and therefore doth he conclude, that al is wholy to be ascribed vnto Gods mercie. See then the good dealing, or rather the lewd falshood of *M. Bishop* and his fellowes, who teaching for the maintenãce of their doctrine of merits, that good works are principally indeede of God, but yet partly of our selues, do alledge *S. Austine* for the defense thereof, who constantly teacheth to the vtter ouerthrow of merits, that our good workes are wholy and onely of the grace of God, and in no part of our selues. This is one thing for which we iustly detest them, as setting vp the glorie of man in stead of the glory of God; the righteousnesse of man in stead of the righteousnesse of God, and so by bearing man in hand with a merit of eternal life, do bereaue them of Gods mercie, by which onely they should attaine the same. And yet all this is graced and shadowed with goodly faire words, as we see here by *M. Bishop*, who hauing said that *the grace of God is principally the cause of our saluation*, and therein implied that our free will also is partly though not principally a cause thereof, yet addeth, that the grace of God is *the onely fountaine of merit and all good workes*. If grace be the *onely fountaine of all good workes*, then all good workes proceed onely from grace, and if onely from grace, then what can we merit or deserue thereby? If we merit and deserue thereby, then they are partly of vs, and of our free will, & then grace is not *the only fountaine of merit and all good works*. Therfore let him not lye in this sort; let him speake as he meaneth, & acknowledge that which they al maintaine, that good works are therfore our merits, because they proceed

c Enchir. cap. 32. Propterea dicit. Non volentis &c. vt detur totum Deo.

See of Freewill, Sect. 152.

proceed from our *Free will*, and are no otherwise our merits, neither do we otherwise deserue by them, but as they proceed from our *free will*. Yea when the grace of God hath done all that appertaineth to it to do, all is nothing with them vnlesse man adioyne thereto the worke of his owne *free will*. Either let him renounce his doctrin of *Free wil*, or else let him leaue with colourable words thus to delude and mocke the simple and ignorant reader, in saying that which he thinketh not, that the grace of God is *the onely fountaine of merit and all good works*.

9. W. BISHOP.

Ad Eph 2. Ad Tit. 3. *Now to those texts cited before about iustification*, We are saued freely, not of our selues, or by the workes of righteousnesse, which we haue done. *I haue often answered that the Apostle speaketh of workes done by our owne forces, without the helpe of Gods grace: and therefore they cannot serue against workes done in and by grace.*

R. ABBOT.

The *grossenesse* of his answer sheweth the corruptiō of his conscience, that was not moued with so often repeating a manifest vntruth. What, was it the Apostles meaning to teach the Ephesians, that they were not saued by the workes which they did, when they yet were [a] *dead* (as he saith) *in trespasses and sinnes*, or had the Ephesians any such opinion that the Apostle should need to reforme in them? Did they renounce their former workes to come to Christ that they might be saued by him, and did they afterwardes grow againe to a conceipt of being saued by their former workes? These are grosse and palpable vntruths, neither hath the Scripture any thing at al, that may giue any shew for warrant of such constructiō. Nay, as hath bene before said, when the Apostle hauing said, [b] *Not of workes least any man should boast*, addeth as a reason and proofe hereof: [c] *for we are his workmanship created in Christ Iesus vnto good workes, &c.* as if he should haue said, We cannot be said to be saued by workes, because our workes are none of ours, but Gods works in vs, he plainely sheweth, that not onely workes before grace, but after also are excluded from being any cause of our saluation. The place to *Titus* likewise resteth our saluation only vpon [d] *Gods mercy*

a Eph. 2. 1.

Ver. 9.

b Ver. 9.

c Ver. 10.

d. Tit. 3. 5.

and

and therefore leaueth no place to our good workes, and therefore it is vsed by *S. Bernard* not only in this day for an exception against workes before grace, but [e] *that we may know at that day, that not for the workes of righteousnesse which we haue done, but of his owne mercie he hath saued vs.*

[e] Bernard. in Cant. ser. 50.

## 10. W. BISHOP.

*Now to that text which he hudleth vp together with the rest, although it deserued a better place, being one of their principall pillars in this controuersie: it is,* The sufferings of this life are not worthy of the glorie to come. *The strength of this obiection lieth in a false translatio of these words,* Axia pros tein doxan *equall to that glory, or in the misconstruction of them: for we grant (as hath bin already declared) that our afflictions and sufferings be not equal in length or greatnesse with the glorie of heauen; for our afflictions be but for the short space of this life, & they cannot be so great as will bee the pleasure in heauen; notwithstanding we teach that the lesser and lesser labour imployed by a righteous man in the seruice of God, doth merite the other greater and of longer continuance, and that by the said Apostles plaine words, for (saith he)* That tribulation which in this present life is but for a moment and light, doth worke aboue measure exceedingly an euerlasting waight of glory in vs. *The reason is, that euen now we receiue one of the fountaine of grace, which giueth a heauenly value vnto his workes. Againe, it maketh him a quicke member of Christ, and so receiuing influence from his head, his works are raised to an higher estimate: it consecrateth him also a temple of the holy Ghost, and so maketh him partaker of the heauenly nature, as S. Peter speaketh: which addeth worth of heauen to his works. Neither is the glory in heauen, which may passe creatures streames into of infinite dignitie, as M. Perkins sobleth, but hath his certaine and bounds & measure, according vnto each mans merits, otherwise it would make a man equall to God in glorie: for there can be no greater then infinite, as all learned men do confesse.*

Rom. 8.

2. Cor. 4.

2. Pet. 1.

## R. ABBOT.

These words of *S. Paule* to the Romanes, [a] *The afflictions of this time are not worthy of the glorie that shall be reuealed vpon vs* are verie directly cited, and are as pregnant to the matter here in hand.

[a] Rom. 8. 18.

*M. Bishop* saith, that that text is one of our *principall pillars in this controuersie*; and indeed it is so strong a piller, as that all *M. Bishops* strength is not able to shake it from vpholding that which we professe to teach by it. But yet *pro forma* he chargeth vs with false translation and misconstruction. He telleth vs, that we should not say, *worthy of the glorie*, but *equall to the glory*. The greeke word, as Gramarians note, doth by his originall signifie those things which being put into the ballance, are of equall waight and poise one to the other, and from thence is it taken to signifie worth or worthinesse because there is a ful correspondencie of value betwixt that that is said to be worthy, and the thing that is worthy of. And according to this vsuall signification of the word, do we translate, *not worthy of the glory, &c.* and though we should translate *not equal*, yet must we perforce vnderstand it as touching equality in worth. And herein their own vulgar translation doth iustifie vs, *Non sunt condignæ passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam, &c.* that is, as the Rhemists translate it, *The passions of this time are not condigne to the glorie to come, &c.* for what is *condigne* but *equall or comparable in worth*; whence they take their *meritum condigni* or *ex condigno*, to bee that which in value and worth is fully equiualent to the reward. Therefore *Arias Montanus ad verbum* readeth it thus, *Non digne æstimamus nunc temporis Ad futuram gloriam, &c. The sufferings of this time are not worthy to the glorie to come*: which what is it, but the same as to say, *they are not comparable in worth to the glory to come*? Now then why doth he go about to impeach our translation, when it is thus approued by their owne? But that it may plainly appeare that we haue no way falsified or misconstrued this text, let vs see in what sort the auntient Fathers haue cited and applyed the same. Saint *Austin* readeth the words thus, [b] *The sufferings of this time are vnworthy to the glory to come*: and saying in another place that [c] *the holy Martyrs are not to be proud as if they did any worthy matter for the participatio of that country where is eternall and true happinesse*: alledgeth afterwards for reason hereof these words, *Because as the Apostle saith, the suffrings of this time are vnworthy, &c.* In the very same sort doth [d] *Ambrose* cite the same words in sundry places, and although

b *August. lib. 83 quæst. 67. Indigne sunt passiones huius temporis, &c.*

c *Idem de ciuit. Dei lib. 5. cap. 18. Nullo modo superbiant sancti Martyres, tanquã digniũ aliquid prestiterint patriæ participatione faciendi, vbi æterna est & vera felicitas. Et sub finem: superbiam extollamur. Quoniam sicut dicit Apostolus, Indigne, &c.*

d *Ambros. de Iacob. lib. 1. cap. 6. & de Interpellat. Iob. lib. 1. cap. 2. & in Psal. 118. ser. 19.*

in the text inserted in his commentary vpon the Epistle to the Romanes, he reade as the vulgar Latine doth, yet in expounding the next verse he expresseth the effect thereof thus. [c] *The Apostle hath said that the sufferings of this time are vnworthy to the glory to come.* Therefore elsewhere alluding to those words, hee sayth that the Saints *whē they shal begin to receiue the glorious reward of their small paines, shall know that the sufferings of this time, are vnworthy to haue so great glory of eternal reward yeelded vnto them.* And againe in another place, [e] *The things which we suffer in this body, are vnworthy of the reward of the glory to come.* *Hierome* vpon that place saith, that [h] *a man could do nothing comparable in worth to the he auenly glorie, albeit it were but euen such as this life is. For whatsoeuer a man shal suffer before death, it is no more then he deserued before by his sinnes. But now both his sinnes be forgiuen him, and then eternall life shal be giuen, the company of Angels, the brightnesse of the Sunne, &c.* *Oecumenius* expoundeth it, that [i] *we cannot suffer any thing worthy of the reward to come, or helpe any whit thereto.* *Fulgentius* hauing said that [k] *the gift of Gods reward doth incomparably and vnspeakeably exceed all the merits of good will and worke of man,* bringeth for proofe hereof these words of the Apostle, *The sufferings of this time, &c.* *Bernard* likewise affirmeth that [l] *the merits of men are not such as that eternal life may be due vnto them of right:* & asking *what are al merits to so great glory:* for confirmation citeth also the same words, and addeth [m] *No not if one man did endure them all.* By all which it may appeare how truly *M. Bishop* and his fellowes make construction of this place, that the sufferings of this time are not *equall in length and greatnesse* to the glory to come, but yet for value and worth they be equall to it, and *the one doth merite the other*, expresly contrary to their owne text and translation. But to proue this, hee alledgeth further that the Apostle saith, that [n] *this momentany & light tribulation worketh vnto vs a farre most excellent and eternall waight of glorie.* Yet we find not here the thing that he would proue, that this short and light tribulation doth merite and deserue that most excellent and eternall waight of glorie: nay who doth not see, that it is plainly excluded by the words? For if our sufferings and good workes be but according to the scant and small measure of our fraile and weake condition, short in time, and light in burden, and

c Idem in Rom. 8 Præsentis temporis passiones indignas dixit ad futuram gloriam.

f Idem de bona mortis cap. 2. Gloriosa mercede laboris exigui impetrantes recipere cognoscent indignas esse passiones huius temporis, quibus remuneratio sionis eterna gloria tanta refertur.

g Idem de interpellat. Dauid ca. 2 Indigna sunt quæ in hoc corpore sustinemus remuneratione futura gloria.

h Hieronim. in Rom. 8. Neuera nihil posset homo condignum pati gloriæ cælesti etiamsi tales esset illa qualis nunc est vita, &c.

i Oecumen. in Rom. 8. Non possumus quicquam futura retributione condignum aut pati aut ad illam conferre.

k Fulgent ad Monim. lib. 1. supra sect. 6.

l Bernard in Annunciat. ser. 1. supra sect. 3.

m Nec si vnus omnes sustineat.

n 2. Cor. 4. 17.

and on the other side, the glory to come bee *exceedingly or beyond measure excellent*, surely then apparent it is, that the littlenesse and lightnesse of the one can neuer in worth attaine to the vnmeasurable excellency of the other. But he will say, the one worketh the other, the affliction *worketh* vnto vs the glory. True, and what then? Doth the one therefore merit and deserue the other? Surelie as it is said of affliction, so it may bee said of them that afflict vs, that they work vnto vs an excellent and an eternal weight of glorie; and yet it cannot be said that they deserue the same for vs. Affliction worketh vnto vs glory, only as an instrumentall cause, which beyond the nature thereof God vseth amongst other meanes to prepare vs and fit vs to bee partakers of his glory. Hee thereby [o] *openeth our eares*, and subdueth our pride, and [p] *healeth our rebellions*, and frameth vs to *vnderstanding*, and [q] *maketh vs partakers of his holinesse*, and [r] *whilest our outward man is corrupted, our inner man is renewed from day to day*. In a word, [s] *when we are iudged, we are chastned of the Lord, that we should not bee condemned with the world*. [t] *Afflictions* (saith *Chrysostome*) *do induce vs to those things that are good and acceptable vnto God*. And thus the Apostle telleth vs, that [u] *all things worke together for good vnto them that loue God*: yea saith *S. Austin*, [x] *euen their very sinnes*: and yet *Master Bishop* will not say, that all things and specially their sinnes do merite and deserue the same good vnto them. Yea the diuell himselfe, by the ouerruling hand of God, is made to worke vnto vs our saluation and glorie, whilest (as *Ambrose* saith) [y] *he armeth vs against himselfe, and by the commandement of Christ is made the keeper of him whom hee would make a pray*; whilest by being exercised with his temptations, wee grow stronger in faith, and patience, and obedience, and so more and more able to resist him. Therefore neither haue these words of the Apostle any thing for *M. Bishops* turne that our sufferings heere doe merite the glory of the life to come. Yet, as if hee had firmely proued his merite, hee goeth on to tell vs how it commeth to passe that our works haue this vertue, *because they issue out of the fountaine of grace, which giueth a heauenly value vnto them*. To which purpose their *Andradius* sayth, that [z] *our workes haue a kind of diuine quality, and wee deserue so much thereby, as the dignity and excellency of the spirit requireth, by which we are led*. But if we haue this heauenly value, no otherwise

o Iob. 33. 16. 17.
p Ose. 14. 5.
q Heb. 12. 10.
r 2. Cor. 4. 16.
s 1. Cor. 11. 32.
t *Chrysost. in Gen. hom. 25. Afflictiones non inducunt vt operemur bona Deoque grata opera.*
u Rom. 8. 28.
x *August. soliloq. cap. 28. Quibus omnia cooperantur in bonum etiam ipsa peccata. vide de corrept. & gratia. cap. 9.*
y *Ambr. de pœnit. lib. 1. cap. 13. Ipse se morsu suo vulnerat & contra se armat, quæ debilitandum putauit, &c. Imperauit Christo & diabolus ipse sit prædæ suæ custos.*
z *Andrad. Orthod. explic. lib. 6. Diuinitatem quandam habeant necesse est, &c. Tantum promerentur, quantum spiritus quo ducuntur dignitas atq; amplitudo postulat.*

wise but as they proceed from the grace of God, what haue wee thereby to challenge to our selues? how should wee be sayd to merite by that that is none of ours? It hath bene already shewed that it cannot be ascribed as a merite vnto vs, which is wrought of God in vs. And it is worth the while to note here the giddinesse of these men. The heauenly value and merite of their workes commeth of the grace of God, and yet forsooth they merite nothing by them but as they proceed from their owne free will. Why are they thus warbling and turning to and fro? Either let them say that the value of good workes is wholy of the grace of God, and then what is the worth thereof to them? or if they will say that they merit thereby, let them say that they haue a value and worth from them, whereby they deserue for them. But what will they say to *Fulgentius* and *Bernard*, who expresly say, as we haue heard, of the good workes that are *giuen of God*, that Gods reward doth *incomparably and vnspeakably exceed all the merite thereof*, and that they are not such as that *by any right eternall life should be due vnto them*. And when *Austine* and *Ambrose* say, that the afflictions of this life are *vnworthy to the glory to come*, of whose afflictions or sufferings do they speake but of the Saints, euen as the Apostle doth, who suffer by the gift and grace of God, are members of Christ and temples of the holy Ghost, euen of those sufferings wherein they suffer with Christ; of which Saint *Ambrose* yet further saith, to shew the meaning of the words here in hand, [a] *He is together glorified, who in suffering for him suffereth with him: and that the Apostle may exhort vs to suffering, he addeth, that al those things which we suffer, are too little and vnworthy, that for the paines thereof so great reward of good things to come should be returned vnto vs.* As for the infiniteness of the glorie of heauen, *M. Bishop* well knoweth, but that his idle head delighteth to make matter to talke of, that *M. Perkins* was neuer so idlely conceited, as to imagine it according to his construction, that any pure creature enioyeth the same in infinite extent of measure and greatnesse, but only of time and continuance, because it hath no end. Now infinite in what sort soeuer, cannot be answered but by that that is infinite. The trespasse of man against the infinite maiestie of God, could not sufficiently be answered but by the infinite punishment, which because it could not be in greatnesse, whereof a creature could not be capable,

a *Ambr. epist. 22. Conglorificatur ille qui patiendo pro ipso compatitur ei, & vt hortetur ad passionem adungit, quoniam minora sunt omnia quæ patimur & indigna pro quorum laboribus tanta rependatur futurorum merces bonorum.*

pable, was therefore ſupplied and made infinite by continuance. For the taking away thereof, there was to be yeelded an infinite ſatisfaction, which the Sonne of God yeelded by the infiniteneſſe of his perſon, though by onely temporarie ſufferings and death. As then to take away a puniſhment not infinite in greatneſſe, but in continuance there was neceſſarily required the merite of an infinite perſon, ſo to purchaſe the glorie of heauen, which to the Saints is infinite in continuance onely, not in greatneſſe, there is likewiſe required the merit of an infinite perſon, which is onely the merite of Ieſus Chriſt; ſo farre are we from doing any thing that may carie any ſemblable proportion of merite and deſert. Now infiniteneſſe of glorie as touching continuance, doth not make a man equall to God, nay it doth not make the Saints of God equall one to another, who are different in meaſure of glorie, though euery one enioyeth the meaſure that he hath infinitely and without end. Thus *M. Biſhop* like a drunken man is ſtill offering to ſtand vp, but at euery next ſtep tumbleth downe againe, and can ſay nothing, but what ſtill redoundeth to his owne harme. The piller wee ſee ſtandeth firme and ſure, and hee can finde no meanes to throw it down.

## 11. W. BISHOP.

M. Perkins *fourth reaſon.* Whoſoeuer will merite, muſt fulfill the whole Law: for if we offend in one commaundement, we are guiltie of the whole Law; but no man can fulfill the whole Law. *ergo.*

*Anſwer. I denie the firſt propoſition: for one good worke done with his due circumſtances, doth bring forth merite, as by all the properties of merite may be proued at large, and by his owne definition of merite ſet downe in the beginning. Now if a man afterward fall into deadly ſin, he leeſeth his former merit: but recouering grace, he riſeth to his former merit, as the learned gather out of that ſaying of our Sauiour, in the perſon of the good father,* Do on him (*that is on his prodigall ſonne returning home*) his former garment. *His ſecond propoſition is alſo falſe, as hath bene proued at large in a ſeuerall queſtion. To that of Saint* Luk. 15. Iames, *although it belong not to this matter, I anſwer, that he who offendeth in one, is made guiltie of all, that is, hee ſhall be as ſurely can-*

*condemned, as if he had broken all: See Saint* Auguſtine. *Epiſt. 29. ad Hieron.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins* ſaith, that hee that will merite muſt fulfill the whole Law. *M. Biſhop* denieth that, and ſaith that *one good worke done with his due circumſtances doth bring forth merite.* Now happie men are they with whom one good worke is of ſo great worth. But what doth a man merite by that one worke? Surely if it bee a merite of heauen, I doubt not but *M. Biſhop* for his part in that meriting facultie wherein hee liueth, hath in his opinion by many merits deuoured a number of the heauens of *Democritus* his innumerable worlds. But I pray you tell vs *M. Biſhop*, if he be [a] *curſed that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the Law*, how ſhould any man merite by performing onely one thing? If life bee tied onely to the doing of all, why doe you make ſo many merites of that which by the ſentence of the Law canne yeeld onely one? Nay *S. Iames* plainely telleth vs, as *M. Perkins* alledgeth, that [b] *he that keepeth the whole Law, and yet faileth in one point, is guilty of all*, that is, he is in generall guilty of breaking the Law, and therefore lieth vnder the curſe that is pronounced by the Law. But this place *M. Biſhop* ſaith *belongeth not to this matter*, and why, but becauſe hee knew not what to ſay vnto it? for that that hee doth ſay, doth fullie make againſt himſelfe. For how ſhould one work done with his due circumſtances bring foorth merite, when notwithſtanding the doing of many workes with their due circumſtances, a man for offending in any one is *as ſurely to be condemned as if he had broken all?* Marry ſaith he, *a man may merite, and after by falling into any mortall ſinne, he loſeth his merite.* But that cannot bee: for the Law as hath been ſaid, maketh no promiſe but to him that fulfilleth all; and therefore till a man haue fulfilled all, hee can merite nothing; and therefore hath merited nothing by any former act or acts, if afterward he fall into any treſpaſſe of the Law. Now therefore there can bee no riſing againe to former merit, where there is no merit at all, & the place which he citeth in that ſort as he citeth it, may import a renewing to the former eſtate; but as touching merit, it importeth nothing at all. But whether thoſe words of *S. Iames* belong to this matter or not, let *S. Ierom* tell him, who thereupō infers thus,

[a] Gal. 3. 10.

[b] Jam. 2. 10.

c Hieron. aduer. Pelag. lib. 2. Quis nostrum aliquando non peccauit? Si autem peccauit (quod negari non potest) & per vnū peccatum omnium est reus peccatorū, non suis viribus sed Dei misericordia saluatur.

[c] *Which of vs hath not ſometime ſinned? And if hee haue ſinned (which cannot be denied) and by one ſinne be guiltie of all ſinnes, then is he not ſaued by his owne power but by Gods mercy.* The place then by his iudgement, taketh away from man all power of beeing ſaued by any thing in himſelfe, and leaueth him to bee ſaued onely by the mercie of God. To the other propoſition of *M. Perkins* argument, he anſwereth alſo by deniall, and ſaith that *in a ſeuerall queſtion* hee hath prooued *that a man may fulfill the whole law*: but by that he hath read the diſproofe of his proofe, it will appeare to him I hope that hee hath prooued nothing. Now it is to bee obſerued how ſlily hee omitteth the place of *S. Iohn* alledged by *M. Perkins*,

d 1. Ioh. 1. 8.

[d] *If we ſay we haue no ſin, we deceiue our ſelues, &c.* which inuincibly prooueth that no man fulfilleth the whole law, becauſe there is no man without ſin, and euerie ſinne is

e Cap. 3. 4.

[e] *the tranſgreſſion of the law.*

## 12. W. Bishop.

*His fift reaſon.* Wee are taught to pray on this maner, Giue vs this day our daily bread: where we acknowledge euerie morſell of bread to bee the meere gift of God, much more muſt wee confeſſe heauen to be.

*Anſ.* M. Perkins *taketh great delight to argue out of the Lords prayer, but he handleth he matter ſo handſomely, that a man may thinke him to be ſo profoundly learned, that hee doth not yet vnderſtand the* Patet noſter: *for who taketh our daily food to be ſo meerly the gift of God, that we muſt not either make it ours with our paine or trauell, wee muſt not looke to be fed from heauen by miracle, by the meere gift of God, but according vnto* S. Pauls *rule, either labour for our liuing in ſome approued ſort, or not eat. Yet becauſe our trauels are in vaine vnleſſe God bleſſe them, we pray to God daily to giue vs our nouriture, either by ſending or preſerning the fruites of the earth, or by proſpering our labours with good ſucceſſe: or if they bee men who liue of almes, by ſtirring vp the charitable to releeue them. So we pray, & much more earneſtly, that God will giue vs eternall life: yet by ſuch meanes as it hath pleaſed God to ordaine, one of which and the principall is by the exerciſe of good workes, which God hath appointed vs to walke in, to deſerue it. And it cannot but ſauour of a Satanicall ſpirit, to call it a Satanicall inſolencie (as* M. Perkins *doth) to thinke that eternall life can bee merited: when Saint* Auguſtine *and the beſt ſpirit of men ſince Chriſts time*

ſo

*so thought and taught in most expresse termes.*

R. ABBOT.

It well appeareth that *M. Perkins* better vnderstood the Lords praier, then that he had any need to learne of any such slender master as *M. Bishop* is. The argument which he vseth, is very effectuall and strong. If we cannot merit the food of this life, but must craue it of gift, much lesse can we merit euerlasting life. But saith *M. Bishop*, *our daily bread is not so meerly the gift of God, but that wee must rather make it ours with our penne or trauell; we must labour for our liuing, &c.* Be it so; and yet by all our expence and labors & trauels we merit nothing; we looke for nothing by desert, but craue it of the blessing and free gift of God. Let *M. Bishop* say, Is there any man, who by his labour and paines canne challenge at Gods hands a morsell of bread as of merit and desert? If hee cannot, but is still bound to cry amidst all his trauels, *Giue vs this day our daily bread*, why doth he put man in opinion of meriting at Gods hands eternall life, who cannot by all his workes bind God vnto him for his daily bread? Wee labour therefore to lay hold of eternall life by such meanes as God hath ordained, and by the exercise of good workes which God hath prepared for vs to walke in, but after all our labour we still beg eternall life at Gods hands, as of his meere blessing and gift, that it may bee true both in the beginning and in the end, that [a] *eternall life is the gift of God through Iesus Christ our Lord*. Yet he telleth vs that God hath appointed good workes for vs to walke in *to deserue eternall life*. But where hath he so appointed? We find that God [b] *in his Sonne hath giuen vnto vs eternall life*, and that hee hath [c] *prepared for vs good workes to walke in*, as the Apostle speaketh, namely to that eternall life which hee hath giuen vs; but that hee hath appointed vs good workes to deserue eternall life, *M. Bishop* cannot tell vs where to find. Now because the spirit of God hath not any where taught vs so to conceiue, what is it but *Satanicall insolency* thus to teach against the doctrine of the spirit? And whereas hee saith that Saint *Austine and the best spirit of men since Christs time, haue taught that heauen may bee merited*, wee first tell him, that all that is nothing vnlesse Christ himselfe haue so taught: and secondly, that hee falsly fathereth

[a] Rom 6. 23.

[b] 1. Ioh. 5. 11.

[c] Ephes. 2. 10.

vpon

vpon the Fathers this misbegotten baſtard of merit, which in that meaning as hee and his fellowes teach it, was neuer imagined by the Fathers, as partly hath appeared already, and ſhall (God willing) appeare further.

## 13. W. BISHOP.

*But let vs heare his laſt argument, which is (as hee ſpeaketh) the conſent of the ancient Church, and then beginneth with* S. Bernard, *who liued a thouſand yeeres after Chriſt: he (in I know not what place, the quotation is ſo doubtfull) ſaith,* Thoſe things which we call merits, are the way to the kingdome, but not the cauſe of raigning. *I anſwer, that merits bee not the whole cauſe, but the promiſe of God through Chriſt and the grace of God freely beſtowed on vs, out of which our merits procede: which is* Bernards *owne doctrine.*

Ser. 61. in Cantic. Manual. cap. 22.

*Secondly, hee citeth* S. Auguſtine: All my hope is in the death of my Lord: his death is my merit. *True in a good ſenſe: that is, by vertue of his death and paſſion my ſinnes are pardoned, and grace is beſtowed on me to do good workes, and ſo to merit.*

In Pſal. 114.

*Thirdly* Baſil: Eternall life is reſerued for them that haue ſtriuen lawfully, not for the merit of their doing, but vpon the grace of the moſt bountifull God. *Theſe words are vntruly tranſlated: for firſt he maketh with the Apoſtle, eternall life to be the prize of that combat, and then addeth, that it is not giuen according vnto the debt and iuſt rate of the workes, but in a fuller meaſure, according vnto the bounty of ſo liberall a Lord: where hence is gathered that common and moſt true ſentence,* That God puniſheth men vnder their deſerts, but rewardeth them aboue their merits.

Pſal. 120.

4. M. Perkins *turnes backe to* Auguſtine *vpon the Pſalm.* 120, *where he ſaith (as* M. Perkins *reporteth)* He crowneth thee, becauſe he crowneth his owne gifts, not thy merits.

*Anſw.* S. Auguſtine *was too wiſe to let any ſuch foolish ſentence paſſe his pen. What congruity is in this?* Hee crowneth thee, becauſe he crowneth his owne gifts, not thy merits. *It had beene better ſaid, He crowneth thee not &c. But he miſtooke belike this ſentence of* S. Auguſtines: When God crowneth thee, he crowneth his gifts, not thy merits. *Which is true, being taken in that ſenſe which he himſelfe declareth:* To ſuch a man ſo thinking (*that is, that he hath merits of himſelfe,*

De grat. & lib. arb. cap. 6.

*selfe, without the grace of God*) it may be most truly said, God doth crowne his owne gifts, not thy merits, if thy merits be of thy selfe, and not from him: but if we acknowledge our merits to proceed from grace working with vs, then we may as truly say, that eternall life is the crowne and reward of merits.

*His other place on the Psalme is not to this purpose, but appertains to the first iustification of a sinner, as the first word, quicken & reuiue me, sheweth plainly: now we confesse that a sinner is called to repentance and reuiued, not for any desert of his owne, but of Gods meere mercie.* Psal. 142.

## R. Abbot.

The place of *Bernard*, is in the very end of his booke *De gratia & libero arbitrio*, where hauing before deuided [a] *the gifts of God into merits and rewards*, he sheweth that merites are wholly to be ascribed vnto God, because [b] *to consent to God, which is the thing wherein merite wholly consisteth, is not of our free will*, but of God himselfe. So that although God in the worke of mans saluation do vse the will of man himselfe, yet there is nothing in the will of man to that purpose, but what is [c] *wholly of the grace of God*. Now hauing disputed and shewed these things at large, in the end of the booke he shutteth vp all with his conclusion, [d] *If properly we will terme those which we call our merites, they are the seed-grounds of our hope, incitements of our loue, tokens of our secret predestination, foretokens of our future happinesse, the way to the kingdome, not the cause of our reigning*, or of our hauing the kingdome. Where plainely he giueth to vnderstand, that whatsoeuer is spoken of *our merites*, is but vnproperly spoken: that God hauing purposed vnto vs eternall life, bestowed his grace vpon vs to leade a godly life, as a foretoken thereof, and therefore that our good workes are but the way wherein God leadeth vs to his kingdome, which hee of his owne mercie hath intended and giuen vnto vs, and not the cause for which hee is moued to bestow the same vpon vs: euen as Saint *Augustine* speaketh, [e] *the way by which hee will bring vs to that end which hee hath promised*. Now what sayth *M. Bishop* to this place of *Bernard*? no question but he hath an answer readie, though by his owne confession he neuer saw the place; so notable a faculkie haue these men

a Bernar. de grat. et lib. arbit. Dona sua Deus in merita diuisit & praemia.

b Non equidem quod consensus ipse in quo meritum omne consistit ab ipso (libero arbitrio) sit, &c. Deus facit velentem, hoc est voluntati sua conscientem.

c Totum ex illa.

d Si proprie appellantur ea quae dicimus nostra merita spes quaedam sunt summaria, charitatis incentiua, occultae praedestinationis iudicia futura salutis praesagia, via regni, non causa regnandi.

e Aug. in Psalm. 109. Via qua nos perduxerit ad finem illum quem promisit.

to tell an Authors meaning before euer they looke into him: forsooth *Bernards* meaning is, that *merits are not the whole cause, but the promise of God through Christ, and the grace of God freely bestowed vpon vs, out of which our merits proceed.* Thus he answereth *Bernard* by a plaine contradiction to *Bernards* words. *Bernard* saith, *they are not the cause*: Yes saith *M. Bishop*, they are the cause, though they be not the whole cause. But see how scholerlike he dealeth therein; for it is as much as if he should say, The tree is not the whole cause of the fruite that it bringeth foorth, but the roote whence it proceedeth, and the boughes whereupon it groweth; whereas the roote and the boughes are parts of the tree, without which it is not a tree; and therefore the exception maketh nothing against it, but that the tree is called the whole cause of the fruite. So saith he, Merits are not the whole cause of saluation, but the grace and promise of God, distinguishing merits as one part of the cause, from the grace and promise of God as another part of the cause; whereas merite by his owne rule in the beginning of this question, doth alwayes necessarily include the promise and grace of God, and can be no merite but as it proceedeth from grace, and hath of God a promise of reward. By this exception therefore he saith nothing to hinder, but that merits are the whole cause of saluation, fully and directly contrary to that that Saint *Bernard* saith, that merites (which he intendeth no otherwise but implying the grace and promise of God) are the *way to the kingdome, but not the cause of our obtaining the kingdome.* Yet of that which he saith, he telleth vs that *it is Saint Bernards owne doctrine*, not alledging any words of *Bernard* to that purpose, but onely quoting a sermon of his where there is nothing for his purpose, as afterwards shall appeare in answering his testimonies of the Fathers. In the meane time, whereas he excepteth that *Bernard* liued a thousand yeares after Christ, I must aunswer him that his testimonie is so much the more effectuall, in that God in the middest of so great corruption and darkenesse did still by him and others continue the light and acknowledgment of this truth.

§ *Aug. Manual. ca. 22. Tota spes mea est in morte Domini mei: mors eius meritum meum; refugium meum, salus, vita & resurrectio mea.*

The next place cited by *M. Perkins* is vnder *S. Austins* name, though that booke indeed be none of his: *All my hope is in the death of my Lord: his death is my merite. M. Bishop* hereto saith that

it

*it is true in a good sense.* Where we see him to bee an apt scholler, and well to haue learned the lesson of the *Index Expurgatorius.* f *Wee set some good sense vpon the errors of the Fathers when they are opposed against vs in contentions with our aduersaries.* But what is that *good sense?* Marry, *by the vertue of his death and passion grace is bestowed on me to merite.* But surely hee doth not thinke that euer the author of those words intended that sense. If hee will make that sense of the one part of the sentence, hee must necessarily make the like of the rest. *The death of the Lord is my merite, my refuge, my saluation, my life and resurrection.* If his meaning be, *the death of the Lord is my merite,* that is, hath purchased for me that I should merit for my selfe; then in the rest also shall bee likewise said, *the death of the Lord is my refuge,* that is, hath purchased for mee that I should bee a refuge for my selfe; *the death of the Lord is my saluation, life and resurrection,* that is, hath purchased for me to bee saluation, life and resurrection to my selfe. So likewise where hee addeth, h *My merite is the mercie of the Lord: so long as the Lord of mercy shall not faile, I shall not want merite:* the meaning shall likewise be, the mercie of the Lord giueth mee ableness to merite for my selfe, and so long as his mercy faileth not, so long shall not I faile of good workes to merite and deserue heauen. Now these constructions are lewd and absurd, and indeede farre from the conscience of the writer of those words, who findeth nothing in his owne workes to comfort himselfe withall, and therefore flieth vnto the death and merite of Christ, and the mercy of God, as his onely succour, and the onely stay that hee hath to rest vpon. Which, that the reader may throughly vnderstand, I hold it not amisse to set downe what the same author hath written in another place of the same booke, euen out of the same spirit: *Let my soule* (saith hee) *bee silent to it selfe, and passe ouer it selfe, not thinking of it selfe, but of thee, O my God, because thou art indeed my whole hope and trust. There is in thee my God and our Lord Iesus Christ, the portion and flesh and blood of euery one of vs. Where my portion raigneth, I beleeue that I also raigne; where my blood liueth, I beleeue that I also haue dominion: where my flesh is glorified, I know that I also am glorious. Albeit I bee a sinner, yet I doubt not of this fellowship of grace. Albeit my sinnes hold backe, yet my substance* (namely being now *of his flesh and his bones*) *requireth it.*

g Index Expur. in castigat. Bertram.

h Meritum meū misericordia Domini: non sum meriti inopt quamdiu misericordiam Dominus mea dabit fuerit.

i Ibid. cap. 13. Ne sit sibi & ipsa anima, et trāseat se nō cogitando se, sed te Deus meus: quoniam tu es reuerata spes & fiducia mea. Est enim in te Deo meo & Domino nostro Iesu Christo omniscuiusque nostrū, & portio, et sanguis.

Albeit

& caro. Vbi ergo portio mea regnat vbi regnat a me credo. Vbi sanguis meum dominatur, vbi dominari me non fido Vbi caro mea glorificatur, vbi gloriosum me esse cognosco. Quamuis peccator sim, tamen de hac communione gratiæ non diffido Etsi peccata mea prohibens substantia mea requirit, Etsi delicta propria mea excludunt, naturæ communio non repellit, &c. Desperare vtique potuissem propter vimia peccata mea & vitia, culpas & infinitas negligentias meas quas ego & quotidie indesinenter ago corde & ore, & opere, & omnibus modis quibus humana fragilitas peccare potest, nisi verbum tuum Deus meus caro fieret & habitaret in nobis. Sed desperare iam non audeo, quoniam subditus ille tibi vsque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis, tulit chyrographum peccatorum nostrorum, & affigens illud crucis peccatis crucifixit & mortem. In ipso autem spiritum respiro, &c.

*Albeit mine owne defaults doe exclude mee, yet fellowship of nature* puiteth mee not away. *I might despaire because of my exceeding great sinnes and corruptions, my defaults are infinite negligences which I haue committed, and dayly without ceasing doe commit in thought, and word and worke, and euery way that humane frailty can sinne, but that thy Word (O my God) became flesh, and dwelt amongst vs. But now I dare not despaire, because hee beeing obedient vnto thee vnto death, euen the death of the crosse, hath taken away the hand-writing of our sinnes, and fastning it to the crosse, hath crucified sinne and death. Now securely I take breath and heart againe, in him who sitteth at thy right hand, and maketh intercession for vs.* By these words, and many other that might bee alledged out of that booke, the Reader may iudge of the construction that *M. Bishop* maketh of the words cited by *M. Perkins*. Wee see nothing here but confession of sinnes in himselfe; no other hope but onely forgiuenes of sins in Christ. Surely these are not the speeches of a man dreaming of an ableneſse giuen vnto him to deserue eternall life. No, no, it was neuer heard of in the world, that the meaning of these words, *My hope is wholy in the death and Merit of Christ*, should bee, that we hope to bee able by Christ to merit and deserue saluation, vntill these brazen faced hypocrites were hired and set to worke by Antichrist for the confusion of soules, by making them to leane vpon the broken staffe of their owne merites, in steed of the onely sauing merit of the bloud of Christ. The faithful haue alwaies in their end betaken themselues to this hold, and many returning vnto God euen at the last gaspe, hauing nothing in themselues to comfort themselues, haue securely reposed their hope in the merit and death of Christ, and with ioy and comfort haue gone to God; who if they had vnderstood hope in Christ according to *M. Bishops* exposition thereof, of beeing to bee made able by Christ to merit heauen, would haue beene rent and torne in peeces with perplexity and feare, neither could haue conceiued any comfort thereof at all. But let him alone, he shall one day vnderstand the vntruth of his answer, when he shall bee glad to make vse of those words which we haue spoken of, or the like without that *good sence* as hee calleth it, which now his senselesse and dead heart imagineth of them. The place of *Basil* is as cleere as the light,

yet he laboureth to cast a mist before it also: but cannot so doe it: but that hee is forced in part to acknowledge the truth on our behalfe. [k] *There is layd up eternall rest* (saith he) *for them that striue lawfully in this life, not to be rendered according to debt for workes, but prouided according to the grace of the bountifull God, for them that trust in him.* Where apparently *Basil* alludeth to the words of the Apostle, [l] *To him that worketh*, that is, to him that hath the righteousnes of workes, *the reward is not imputed* * *by fauour but by debt*; and therefore the phrases being borrowed from the Apostle, must with him haue the same meaning as with the Apostle they haue. His meaning then is plaine, that that eternall rest is not rendred *by way of debt, but by way of fauour and grace*; and neuer hath any ecclesiasticall writer vnderstood those phrases otherwise. Onely *M. Bishop* telleth vs, that *Basils* meaning is, that it is not rendred *according to the debt of workes*, that is, *according to the iust rate of workes, but in a fuller measure, and aboue our merites*. But his masters of Rhemes reiect this commentary of his, and doe tell him that our workes are *fully worthy of euerlasting life*. God then doth not exceede the rate of our workes, as they say, but giueth onely what wee are *fully worthy of*, what we fully and iustly merit and deserue thereby. Yea and [m] they saw well, that to teach otherwise as *M. Bishop* doth is to ouerthrow merite. For if God do giue vs aboue our merits, then wee doe not merit that which God giueth; or if wee doe merite it, then it cannot be said to bee aboue our merites. But it is aboue our merites, sayth *M. Bishop*, therefore it followeth necessarily that wee doe not merit or deserue it. Yea wee haue seene before out of *Fulgentius* and *Bernard*, that Gods reward doth so *incomparably* exceede all the merite and worke of man, as that eternall life is not *due thereunto by right, neither should God doe any wrong if hee did not giue it*: and therefore the sentence of *Basill* is true, according to the Apostles intendment of those termes which hee vseth, that *eternall life is not rendered by way of debt for workes, but by grace*, that is, freely *bestowed to them that trust in him*. *M. Bishop* telleth vs, that *hee maketh eternall life to be the prize of the combat*: but what of that, seeing hee giueth vs to vnderstand that this *prize* is with fauour and mercie proposed, and with the same mercie and fauour rendred to them that fight the combat? Therefore hee saith in another place,

[k] *Basil. in Ps. 114.* Πρόκειται ἀναπαυσις αἰωνία τοῖς νομίμως τὸν ἀγῶνα διαθλοῦσιν βίου, οὐ κατ' ὀφείλημα ἀπαιτουμένη ἀμοιβὴν ἀλλὰ χάριτι μισθαποδότου θεοῦ τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλπίσασιν παραχωρουμένη.

[l] Rom. 4.

* οὐ κατὰ χάριν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα.

[m] *Rhem. Testam. Annot. 2. Tim. 4.*

*There*

n Basil. de humilit. Οὐδὲν ὑπολείπεται σοι καυχᾶσθαι ἐπ' ἀλαζονείᾳ ὦ ἄνθρωπε, ὃ τὸ κεκτῆσθαι μὴ ἐλαβες, ὡς τὸ ἐλπίζειν σε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι σώζεσθαι ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἢ τῶν σῶν κατορθωμάτων, ζητοῦσι δὲ τὴν σὴν χρῖσιν ἐν τῷ μὴ ὀφείλειν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἐπιδείκνυσθαι ἔργον, τὸ ὅλον ἐν χάριτι ζῶντες καὶ δωρεᾷ θεοῦ.

n *There is nothing left thee O man to glorie of, whose glorying and hope consisteth in this, that thou mortifie all that is thine, and seek in Christ the life to come; whereof hauing the first fruits wee are now therein, liuing wholly by the grace and gift of God.* There is then with *Basil* no merit, no debt in any sort, because we liue wholy by the grace and gift of God, so that *M. Bishops* exposition is but a meere falsification of *Basils* words.

*M. Perkins* further alledgeth a saying of *Austin, He crowneth thee, because hee crowneth his owne gifts, not thy merits. M. Bishop* answereth, that *S. Austin was too wise to let any such foolish sentence passe his pen.* Hee questioneth the matter, *What congruity is it* to say thus? Hee directeth a better forme of speech, *It had bene better said thus.* Now if the sentence be S. *Austins*, what will men but take *M. Bishop* for a foole, that wold so vnaduisedly *befoule S. Austin*, and take vpon him to correct his words when hee had no cause? The place indeed is misquoted, either by *M. Perkins* mistaking, or by the ouersight of the Printer, for in stead of *Psal.* 102. hee hath quoted *Psal.* 120. by misplacing of the figure, a very small and easie ouersight. But S. *Austin* in *Psal.* 102. hath these words, *He crowneth thee because he crowneth his owne gifts, not thy merits.* Which is the same in effect with that which *M. Bishop* putteth in place of it, very often repeated by *S. Austin*, either in the same or very neer the same words, that God when he crowneth vs, [p] *crowneth his owne gifts, not our merits.* But he answereth hereto very vntruly and deceitfully It is true indeed that *S. Austin* there speaketh to him that thinketh he hath merits of his owne and of himself, that God wil not crown those because they are onely euill, and hee giueth not the crowne to euill workes, but he crowneth only his owne gifts, because in vs there is no good worke, to which onely the crowne is giuen, but onely by Gods gift. [q] *To him that so thinketh,* (saith hee) *it is rightly said, God crowneth his own gifts, not thy merits, if thou haue thy merits of thy selfe and not of his gift: for if they be such, they be euill, and God crowneth not those that be euill, but if they be good, they be the gifts of God.* Now to those words *M. Bishop* addeth in the same letter as if it were *S. Austins*, whether by the Printers fault, or by his owne lewd falshood he can best tell himself, this animaduersion, *But if we acknowledge our merits to proceed from grace working with vs: so may wee as truly say, that eternall life is the crowne and reward of merits.*

o *August. in Psal.* 102. *Ergo coronat te, quia dona sua coronat non merita tua.*

p *Idē epist.* 105. *et in Ioan. trac.* 5. *& de grat. et lib. arb. c.* 6. 7.

q *De grat. et lib. arb. c.* 6. *Prorsus saluo cogitanti verissimè dicitur, dona tua coronat Deus, non merita tua, si tibi & te ipso, non ab illo sunt merita tua. Haec enim si talia sunt, mala sunt: quae autem mala sunt, non coronat Deus. Si autem bona sunt, Dei dona sunt.*

But

But *M. Bishop* did *S. Austine* tell you so? Will you so wilfully abuse him and pervert his words and meaning? Surely in the beginning of the next Chapter, which is but ten lines after the words cited, *S. Austine* saith thus: [r] *If then thy good merits be Gods gifts, God doth not crowne thy merits as thy merits, but as his owne gifts.* In which words he plainely denieth, that there is any respect of our merit, or that God accounteth vs as hauing merited, but that he giueth the crown and reward onely as to his owne gifts which he himselfe hath bestowed vpon vs. How bad a man then is *M. Bishop*, to make *S. Austin* say, that God crowneth our good works proceeding from his grace as our merits, when *S. Austine* expressly and flatly denieth the same. But there is yet some further poison hidden in his words: for when he nameth *merits proceeding from grace working with vs*, he diuideth betwixt God and vs that which *S. Austin* maketh entirely the gift of God. The worke is not meerely of the grace of God in vs, but *of grace working with vs*, because we also as well as grace are partakers of the worke. So then *S. Austin* must not say, that *God crowneth his owne gifts not our merits; but God crowneth partly his owne gifts, and partly our merits*, because the good works which he crowneth are partly of his grace, and partly also of our owne freewill. By this meanes *Master Bishop* would bold a very absurd, which the same *Saint Austin* saith in the other place: [t] *When God crowneth our merits he crowneth nothing else but his owne gifts*: for if hee crowne *nothing else but his owne gifts*, if he crown nothing at all of ours, then what part of the crowne is it that we can say is merited and deserued by vs?

His answer to the last words of *Austine* is excluded by the very words themselues: [u] *Lord, for thy names sake thou wilt quicken me in thy righteousnesse, not in mine, not because I haue deserued it, but because thou art mercifull.* This place he saith *appertaineth to the first iustification of a sinner*, but it seemeth he gaue the answer somewhat too early in the morning before his eyes were well opened: for otherwise he might haue seene, that these are the words of a man already iustified, uttered in the name of the Prophet God, not in the preterperfect tense as of a thing past, but in the future tense, as of a thing to come: *Thou shalt or wilt quicken me*, and therefore cannot be vnderstood of any first iustification. The Prophet being already in part reuiued, so the life of God, prayeth

[r] *Ibid. cap. 7. Si ergo Dei dona sunt merita tua, non Deus coronat merita tua tanquam merita tua sed tanquam dona sua.*

[t] *Epist. 105. Cùm Deus coronat merita nostra nihil aliud coronat quàm munera sua.*

[u] *Aug. Psal. 142. Propter nomen tuum Domine viuificabis me: in iustitia tua iustitia, non in mea, nō quia ego meruī, sed quia tu misereris.*

ſtil to be reuiued and quickened more and more, and promiſeth to himſelfe by aſſurance of faith through the holy Ghoſt, that God will ſo do, *not in my righteouſnes*, ſaith he, as *Auſtin* expreſſeth it *not becauſe I haue deſerued it, but for his owne names ſake, for his owne meeres ſake*, giuing to vnderſtand, that not onely the beginning of the worke of God, but alſo the proceeding thereof is, not for any merit of man, but by the mercy of him by whom it was firſt begun. And whereas he ſaith that they confeſſe, that *a ſinner is called to repentance and reuiued, not for any deſert of his owne, but of Gods meere mercie*, he doth but blind his Reader with a concealed diſtinction of merit, hauing himſelfe before taught, that his workes of preparation are the cauſe of the iuſtification of a ſinner, as he hath corruptly argued out of the words of Chriſt, *Many ſinnes are forgiuen her, becauſe ſhe hath loued much*. So that the terme of *meere mercie* is vſed only colourably & for faſhion ſake, neither doth he acknowledge the *meere mercy* of God in any ſort, but as the Pelagian hereticks did, in the firſt offer of his grace.

u Of Iuſtificati. on. Sect. 21.

## 14. W. Biſhop.

*Hauing thus at length anſwered vnto all that* M. Perkins *hath alledged againſt Merits: let vs ſee what can be ſaid for them, following as neare as I can* M. Perkins *order.*

Obiections of Papiſts, ſo he termeth our reaſons.

*Firſt, in ſundry places of ſcripture, promiſe of reward is made vnto good works.* If thou do wel, ſhalt thou not receiue? To him that doth well there is a faithfull reward. Feare not to be rewarded vnto death, becauſe the reward of God remaineth for euer. *And* When you are reuiled & perſecuted for my ſake, reioyce, for great is your reward in heauen, *and elsewhere ſuch like: therefore there is ſome merit or reward to be looked for.*

Gen. 4. Prou. 11. Eccli. 8. Mat. 5.

M. Perkins *anſwereth firſt, that the reward of euerlaſting life, is without any thing done by man. Ans.* This is moſt apparently falſe, for the Scripture expreſſeth the very workes wherefore it is a reward. *Againe, a reward in Engliſh ſuppoſeth ſome former pleaſure which is rewarded, otherwiſe it were to be called a gift, & not a reward. & much more the Latine and Greeke word,* Merces, Mercedes, *which rather ſignifie a mans hire and wages, then a gift or reward. Wherefore* M. Perkins *skipped*

10

*to a second shift: that forsooth eternall life is an inheritance, but not a reward.*

Reply. *We know well that it is an inheritance, because it is onely due vnto the adopted sonnes of God: but that hindreth not it to be a reward, for that it is our heauenly Fathers pleasure, that al his sonnes comming to the years of discretion shal by their good cariage either deserue it, or else for their bad behauiour be disinherited.*

M. Perkins *hauing so good reason to distrust his two former answers, flies to a third: and graunteth that eternall life is a reward, yet not of our workes, but of Christs merits imputed vnto vs: this is that castle wherin he holds himselfe safe from all Canon shot: but he is foully abused, for this answer is the most extreamest of all the rest, as being furthest off from the true sense of the Scripture: examine any one of the places, and a babe may discouer the incongruity of it: namely, Christ saith, that great is their reward who are reuiled and persecuted for his sake: assigning the reward vnto their constant bearing and enduring of tribulation for Gods sake, and not to his owne merites imputed: and if you desire a formall sentence stating this purpose, take this:* Euery man shall receiue his reward, according vnto his owne proper labour, *and not according to Christs merits imputed vnto him.* So a doer of the work shall be blessed in his deede: *and not in the imputation of anothers deed.* 1. Cor. 3. Iac. 1.

## R. Abbot.

Here *M. Bishop* hauing hitherto said much, and answered iust nothing, falleth in hand to sharpen his tooles and weapons againe, which were blunted and dulled by *M. Perkins*. And first, he opposeth places where mention is made of *reward*, presuming that *reward* must necessarily suppose and enforce *merit and desert*. To this *M. Perkins* hath answered, that *reward* is twofold: *of debt, & of mercie*. Eternall life, he saith, is *a reward of mercy giuen of the good will of God*, and not properly repayed as due to any thing that is done by man. *M. Bishop* replieth, that *this is apparently false: for the Scripture* (saith he) *expresseth the very works thereof: it is a reward*. But answer him againe, that it is not false, but very true, because although the Scripture do set foorth vnto vs eternal life as the reward of such & such works, yet that is not to tye the Originall of the reward to the worke, but onely to note the sequele thereof: the reward being in truth deriued from a former mercie whereby it was promised before

the worke, and by which both the worke and the reward are giuen vnto vs. Nay, [a] *They yet were not themselues*, saith *S. Austin*, *to whom saluatiō was promised, that no man might glory in his merits: yea they to whom it was promised, were also promised themselues, that the whole body of Christ may say, By the grace of God I am that I am.* [b] *What see, nor God promised*, saith he againe, *hee promised it to vs beeing vnmerthie, that it might not bee promised as a reward to workes, but being grace might according to the name be freely giuen.* So that although eternall life be, *as it were a reward for righteousnesse*, yet it is indeed but *grace for grace*, as out of him also we haue heard before. But saith *M. Bishop*, *a reward in English supposeth some former pleasure which is rewarded.* But that is not alwaies so: for I doubt not but many times an English begger hath come to him and asked him a reward, at whose hands notwithstanding he hath receiued no former pleasure: and euen so must *Master Bishop* begge at Gods hands *the reward* of euerlasting life. Yea but then it should *be called a gift and not a reward*: and did not hee know that it is called *a gift*? [d] *Eternall life* (saith *Saint Paule*) *is the free gift of God.* Christ saith of his sheepe: [e] *I giue vnto them eternall life.* [f] *This is the record*, saith *Saint Iohn*, *that God hath giuen vnto vs eternall life.* It may be he cannot see how it should be called both *a gift and a reward*. I will tell him therefore that *secundum quid*, and in respect it is called *a reward*, but simply and absolutely it is onely gift. Compare eternall life to the worke, and look no further, and so the Scripture calleth it a reward. But consider the original from whence the work it selfe also proceedeth, and all is meerly and wholy gift: yea and though in act and execution the work be before the reward, yet in intendement & purpose that which we call the reward is before the work, and God therefore giueth vs good works, because formerly by his election he giueth vs eternall life. From the English word he goeth to the Greek and Latin, μισθὸς, and *merces*, & saith, *they rather signifie hire or wages, then gift or reward.* And what of that, seeing the Apostle teacheth vs to distinguish that [g] μισθὸς, *wages*, may bee reckoned to a man *by fauour & not by debt*. For he could not say: [h] *To him that worketh, the wages is not imputed by fauour, but by debt*, but that there is an imputing of wages by fauor also. And this appeareth in the, who being called into the vineyard at the 11. houre, yet receiued for wages, [i] *by fauor*, not *by debt*, as much as they who were first called,

a *Aug in Ps. 118. conc. 13. Nondum erant quibus promitteretur ne quisquā de meritis gloriaretur: & quibus promissum est, etiam ipsi promissi sunt, vt totū corpus Christi dicat, Gratia Dei sum id quod sum.*
b *Idem in Psal. 109. vt supra Sect. 2.*
c *Idem de grat. & lib. arbit. cap. 8. Supra sect. 8.*
d Rom. 6. 23. τὸ χάρισμα.
e Ioh. 10. 28.
f 1. Ioh. 5. 11.
g Rom. 4. 4.
h Mat. 20. 10. 14

called, and *had borne the burden and heate of the day.* The Lord of the viney ard gaue the the same wages, [i] *not as paying a price to their labour, but powring foorth the riches of his goodnesse to them whom he chose without works, that euen they also who haue sweat with much labour, and haue receiued no more then the last, may vnderstand, that they haue receiued a gift of grace, not a wages for their workes.* Thus *M. Bishop* seeth *hire and wages* to be a matter of fauour, and the *reward of workes*, in some sort so called, to be nothing else indeed but *a gift of grace.* And if he will vnderstand it otherwise, let him heare the resolution of *Marke* the Heremite, saying: [k] *Some not keeping the commandements, yet thinke they beleeue aright: againe, some there are who keeping the commandements hope to receiue the kingdome of heauen as a wages due vnto them: both of these faile of obtaining the same.*

i *Prosper. de voc. Gent. lib. 1. cap. 5. Non laboris pretiũ soluens sed munitas bonitatis suæ in eos quos sine operibus eligit effundens vt etiã ij qui in multo labore sudarunt, nec amplius quã nouissimi acceperunt, intelligant donũ se gratiæ, non operũ accepisse mercedẽ.*

k *Mark herem. De his qui putant ex operibus se iustificari.*

μὴ ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς μείζονα ἔχειν ἆθλα νομίζουσι. τοῖς δὲ ποιοῦσι τὰς μὴ θεοπαίδευτον ἢ βασιλείαν ἐπιδιδόναι χάριν· ἀμφότερα γὰρ βασιλείας ἀπεφάναντο.

*M. Perkins* answereth secondly, that *the kingdome of heauen is properly an inheritance*, but is called *a reward onely by figure & resemblance.* To this *M. Bishop* replieth, that *it is an inheritance, because it is onely due to the adopted sonnes of God.* But that is not all: for it is not so called onely, because it is onely due to the adopted sonnes of God, but because by vertue of their adoption they haue the title of it, euen by being new borne the sonnes of God. For inheritance is a matter of birth, and though a man be of neuer so good deserte, yet can he haue no title of inheritance thereby. The younger brother may be of better desert then the elder, yet that cannot make him his fathers heire. Where the thing is by desert, a man can haue no title to it till he haue deserued it, but what is by inheritance a man hath the right of it before he can do any thing towards the deseruing of it. When therfore the Scripture setteth foorth vnto vs eternal life vnder the cõdition of inheritãce, it plainly teacheth vs, that we attaine not vnto it by any merits or workes, but that before any works God by adopting vs to be his children, giueth vs the state & prerogatiue thereof. And therfore whereas *M. Bishop* saith, that *it is our heauenly Fathers pleasure, that all his sonnes cõming to the years of discretion, should by their good cariage either deserue it, or else for their bad behauior be disinherited*, he speaketh at all aduenture, quite contrarie to the nature of the thing whereof he speaketh. And see how improbably he speaketh in respect of humane courses, to which he alludeth: what is there no remedy but that a son must either deserue his inheritãce, or else be disinherited? Are fathers wont to measure

their Children by that rule? Is there no meane betwixt these two? Surely the behauiour of the heire is seldome such, as may be said to deserue the inheritance whereto he is borne, and yet fathers do not disinherit their children for not deseruing. There is an indifferent behauior of sonnes that yeeldeth no desert, & there is many times behauior whereby they ill deserue, and yet by birth the right of inheritance standeth good vnto him. And this is our title, euen our new birth in Iesus Christ, whereby we are l *made heires of euerlasting life*, when as notwithstanding our behauiour is such, as that being strictly examined, we well know that we deserue the contrarie. As for that which he saith of disinheriting, it is sometimes found with men who cannot reclaime their sonnes from euill courses, or fashion them to their own desire, (which what Father would not do, if it were in his power to do it, to auoyde the disinheriting of his sonne?) but with God who hath the hearts of his children in his hands, and can dispose them to his owne will, it is neuer found: but in this case it holdeth which the Apostle saith: m *The gifts & calling of God are without repentance*: that is, as *S. Austine* saith, n *they are firmely setled without any change.*

l Tit. 3. 7.

m Rom. 11. 29.

n *Augustin. de Prad. Sanct. cap. 16. Sine ullo stabilitèr fixa sunt.*

The third answer *M. Perkins* addeth, not for any distrust of the two former, but to giue further strength vnto them, and this answer is indeed *a castle*, that o *M. Bishops Canon shot* is not able to shake. He saith, that *it is more extrauagant then the rest, and furthest off from the true sense of Scripture* and I know not what, but all his extrauagant tearmes will not helpe him to auoid the force of it. It is first to be noted how he peruerteth *M. Perkins* his words: for *M. Perkins* denieth not but that eternall life is the reward of our works, but faith, if it be granted to be *a deserued reward*, is is not for our works, but for Christs merits imputed vnto vs. It is then the reward of our workes, not for the desert of our workes, but because Christ by his merits hath purchased it and we in him receiue it for reward of our works. To his merits only the reward is assigned and giuen to our vse: for his works sake is it that any reward is promised or yeelded to our works. *For* o *in him all the promises of God are yea and Amen*: for his sake they were first made, and for his sake they are performed. The father giuing vnto vs his son, p *together with him giueth vs al things*: q *He hath giuen vnto vs eternal life, but this life is in his Son*; in his obedience, in his merits eternal life is the reward of our works.

o 2. Cor. 1. 20.

p Rom 8. 32.

q 1. Ioh. 5. 11.

If

If it be ſaid, [r] *Bleſſed are ye when men reuile you, and perſecute you for my names ſake: great is your reward in heauen*, it is for Chriſts ſake that it is ſaid: *Bleſſed are ye; great is your reward in heauen.* If it be ſaid: [s] *Euery man ſhall receiue his reward according to his labour*, it is for Chriſts ſake that it is ſo ſaid. If it be ſaid: [t] *The doer of the word ſhall be bleſſed in his deede*, it is for Chriſts ſake, that *he ſhall be bleſſed in his deed.* For if we conſider our perſons, the Father [u] *hath accepted vs in his beloued*, in Ieſus Chriſt, and [x] *in him is well pleaſed* towards vs. If we looke to our works, our ſufferings, our ſeruice, all our *ſpirituall ſacrifices are acceptable to God*, not by their owne worth, not by our deſert, but [y] *by Ieſus Chriſt*, by his merits, by his deſerts, & therfore by his merits haue the reward alloted vnto them Thus *M. Biſhop* fighteth hard and getteth no ground: he thinketh, poore man, that hee hath troden *M. Perkins* vnder foote, but *M. Perkins* liueth triumphantly in heauen, & he liueth a baſe conquered man here vpon the earth, & by his defending of Merits, ſecludeth himſelfe from that mercy, whereby he ſhould attaine heauen.

[r] Mat.5.11.12.
[s] 1.Cor.3.8.
[t] Iam.1.25.
[u] Epheſ.1.6.
[x] Mat.3.17.
[y] Pet.2.5.

## 15. W. Biſhop.

*Inſtead of our ſecond reaſon blindly propoſed by* M. Perkins, *I will confirme the firſt with ſuch text of holy Writ, as ſpecifie plainly our good works to be the cauſe of eternall life.* Come vnto me ye bleſſed of my Father, poſſeſſe a kingdom prepared for you. *And why ſo?* For when I was hungry, ye gaue me meat, &c. *the like is in the ſame chapter of the ſeruants, who employed all their talents: for their Lord ſaid vnto thē:* Becauſe you haue been faithfull in few things, I will place you ouer many. *And many ſuch like: where good works done by the parties themſelues are expreſly ſaid to bee the very cauſe why God rewardeth them with the kingdome of heauen. Therefore hee muſt needs bee holden for a verie wrangler, that doth ſeeke to peruert ſuch euident ſpeeches, and would make the ſimple beleeue, that the cauſe there formally ſpecified, is not to be taken for the cauſe, but doth only ſignifie an order of things. But if any deſire beſides the euidence of the text, to ſee how the ancient Fathers take it, let him read S. Auguſtine, where he thus briefly handleth this text:* Come ye bleſſed of my Father, receiue; what ſhall wee receiue? a kingdome: for what cauſe? becauſe I was hungrie, and you gaue mee meate, &c. *Of the reall imputation of Chriſts*

Mat.25.

In Pſal.40.

*merites, there was nothing in those daies: and that iudicious Doctor found, that good works was the cause of receiuing the kingdom of heauē.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Bishop* to help the former argument addeth some texts of holy writ, which *specifie plainely*, as he saith, *our good workes to bee the cause of eternall life*. To this purpose hee alledgeth the wordes of Christ as touching the last iudgment: [a] *Come ye blessed of my Father; possesse*, or rather, [b] *inherite ye the kingdom prepared for you before the foundations of the world; for I was hungry and ye gaue me meate, &c.* Where the very place it selfe disproueth that that hee intendeth to proue by it: for by that that he saith, *Inherit ye the kingdome*, it is plainely gathered which *S. Ambrose* thence affirmeth: [c] *We receiue as a possession of inheritāce those things that are promised vnto vs.* And if we receiue the kingdome by way of inheritance, then it is not by merit, as hath already been declared. Againe, when he saith, *prepared for you from the foundations of the world*, euen as *S. Paul* saith, [d] *God hath chosen vs in Christ before the foundations of the world*, hee sheweth that the kingdome was prepared for them that inherit it, before they had any works: and therefore, to reason in the same maner as the Apostle doth: [e] *not by workes, but by* (the grace and mercy of) *him that calleth, it is said: Come ye blessed, inherit the kingdom, &c.* For to say that God [f] *prepared* the kingdome for them, *vpon foresight of their workes*, is the heresie of the Pelagians long agone condemned. It must needs bee therefore that it was prepared for them without respect of workes, and that their works are alledged not as the proper cause for which the kingdom is giuen vnto them, but as signes & tokens that they are they for whom it is prepared, euen as before wee heard out of *S. Bernard*, that [g] *they are tokens of our predestination, foretokens of our future happinesse, the way to the kingdome, not the cause of our obtaining it.* No more can bee argued out of the other place. Reward wee find there, but *Merit* wee find none, neither can the one of these be euicted by the other. It only sheweth how God graceth his faithfull seruants by assigning vnto them vnder the name of *reward*, that wich indeede hee otherwise freely bestoweth vpon them. A most cleere example whereof we haue in our father *Abraham*, to whom God made at first an abso-

a Mat. 25. 34.

b κληρονομήσατε

c *Ambros. de obitu Theodos. Tanquam possessionem hereditariam recipimus ea quæ promissa sunt nobis.*

d Ephes. 1. 4.

e Rom. 9. 11.

f *August. contra Julian. Pelag. lib 5. cap. 3. Ne fortè ante constitutionem mundi ex operibus præcognitis putaremur electi, secutum est & adiunxit, si autē gratia, &c. vide Epist. 105.*

g *Bernard. de grat. & lib. arb. Occulta predestinationis indicia, futura fœlicitatis præsagia, via regni, non causa regnandi.*

lute promise, that he would [h] *make of him a great nation, and would blesse him, and in him all nations of the earth should be blessed*, and yet afterwards vpon the triall that hee made of him for the offering of his son *Isaac*, taketh occasion to renew the promise, as if he would doe it for his obedience therein. [i] *Because thou hast done this thing, and hast not spared thine onely sonne, therefore will I surely blesse thee, & I will multiply thy seede after thee, &c. and in thee shall all nations of the earth bee blessed, because thou hast obeied my voice.* The blessing was assured to *Abraham* infallible by the former absolute promise of God, [k] *without any caution or condition*, as *Prosper* well saith; but hee would haue *Abraham* to take knowledge by occasion of that that hee had done, that the promise before freely made, should inuiolably & without any impeachment stand good vnto him. Euen so God from our works taketh occasion of the renewing of his promises, & thereto for our assurance tieth the performance therof vnder the name of reward, when as the true cause of all is his mercy in Iesus Christ, by whom onely it is that the worke is accepted in his sight. Now if God vouchafe to honour vs, let not vs thereby take occasion to dishonour him, or challenge proudly to our merits, that for which we should sing praise onely to his mercy. Neither do we heerein wrangle or peruert the Scripture, but finding by the Scripture that God hath chosen and called vs, [l] *that we should bee to the praise of the glory of his grace*, [m] *which is not grace at any sort, except it be free in euery sort*, we endeauor that this glory may be yeelded entirely vnto God, and that to this end it may alwaies bee acknowledged, that [n] *eternall life is the gift of God, through Iesus Christ our Lord.* Now whereas he alledgeth *S. Austen* to his purpose, he abuseth *S. Austen* as he is wont to do, who questioneth not any cause in the place by him cited, but vsing the wordes, *Come ye blessed of my Father, receiue ye a Kingdome*, goeth on heereupon to demand, not as Master *Bishop* saith, *For what cause*, but [o] *for what thing?* He answereth, *I was hungry and ye gaue me to eat. What is there so base*, saith hee, *what so contemning be euill, as to breake bread to the hungry? As so much is the Kingdome of heauen valued vnto thee. If thou haue no abilitie to breake bread to the hungry, &c. yet giue a cup of cold water, cast two mites into the treasury. The widow for two mites bought as much as* Peter *forsaking his nets, as* Zachee *did in giuing halfe his goods. It is valued vnto thee at so much as thou hast.* Thus the

h. Gen. 12. 2. 3.

i. Cap. 22. 16.

k *Prosper de vocat. gent. lib. 1. ca. 3. Sine conditione promisit, sine lege donauit.*

l Ephes. 1. 6.

m *August. cont. Pelag & Celest. li. 2. cap. 24. Non enim Dei gratia erit vllo modo si non fuerit gratuita omnimodo.*

n Rom. 6. 23.

o *Aug. in Psalm. 49. Quid percipite? Regnum. Pro quare? Esuristi, &c. Quid tam vile, quid tam terrenum quàm frangere panem esurienti? Tanti valet Regnum cælorum. Si non habes facultatem fragendi panem, &c. da calicem aquæ frigidæ; mitte duo minuta in gazophylacium. Tantum emit vidua duobus minutis, quantum emit Petrus relinquendo retia, quantum emit Zacheus dando dimidium patrimonii. Tanti valet quantum habueris.*

the purpose of this *iudicious Doctour*, is directly against Master *M. Bishops* cause of receiuing the Kingdome of heauen, shewing how base and of how little worth the things are, whereto God notwithstanding of his vouchsafing grace recurneth the Kingdome of heauen, that we may know that it is not for our merits sake that he bestoweth the same. As for the *imputation of Christs merits*, *M. Bishop* knoweth no vse of it, because he yet knoweth not himselfe, but he will then know the vse of the merits of Christ, when he commeth to know how vainly and fondly hee hath presumed of his owne. To the true Church of Christ, it was neuer strange tidings that Christs merites should bee imputed vnto them; whose hope hath alwaies beene to find fauour at Gods hands, by vertue of that merit that he hath performed for them.

## 16. W. Bishop.

*Heereby the way* M. Perkins *redoubleth that common slander of theirs: that we take away a part of Christs mediation.* For, saith he, if Christs merits were sufficient, what needs ours? *It hath beene told them, but they will neuer learne to vnderstand it: I will yet once againe repeat it. We hold our Saviours merits to be of infinite value, and to base deserued of God all the graces and blessings, which haue or shall be bestowed vpon all men, from the beginning of the world vnto the end of it: yet his diuine will and order is, that all men of discretion hauing freely receiued grace from him, do merit that crown of glory, which is prepared for them, not to supply the want of his merits, which are infinitable, but being members of his mysticall body, he would haue vs also like vnto himself in this point of meriting: and further desirous to traine vs vp in all good works he best knew, that there could be no better spurre to pricke our dull nature forward, then to ordaine and propose such heauenly rewards vnto all them that would diligently endeauour to deserue them. The man seemes to bee much ignorant in the matter of Christs mediation: I will therefore helpe him a little. It consisteth in reconciling man to God: which hee performed by paying the ransome of our sinnes, in purchasing vs Gods fauour, and in ordaining meanes how all mankinde might attaine to eternall life: in the two first points we do for the most part agree: to wit, that our sinnes are freely pardoned through Christs passion: and that we are as freely iustified, and receiued first in-*

to

to Gods grace and fauour: although we require other preparation then they do, yet we as fully denie any merit of ours to be cause of either, as they do. Marry about the meanes of attaining to be auoyded, we differ altogether: for they say that God requires no iustice in vs, nor merit at all on our parts, but only the disposition of faith, to lay hold on Christs righteousnesse and merits: but we say that Christs righteousnesse and merit, are incommunicable vnto any mere creature: but that through his merits, God doth powre into every true Christian a particular iustice, whereby he is sanctified, and made able to do good workes, and to merit eternall life. Which ability we receiuing of Gods free gift, through Christs merits, doth much more magnifie both Gods grace, and Christs merits: for the greater that the gift is, the greater is the glory of the giuer. And to argue that to be a derogation vnto his mediation and merits, which he hath appointed to be the very instrument of applying the vertue of them to vs, is indeede vnder colour of magnifying Christs merits, to vndermine and blow out all the vertue of them. But saies Master Perkins, what should we talke of our merits, who for the good workes we do, commit many bad, which defile our merits, if we had any?

True it is, as it was once before said, that euery mortall sinne blotteth out all former iustice and merit: but by repentance both are recouered againe: but must we not speak of any good, because we may happe to do euill? this is a fit perswasion, and well worthy a wise man.

## R. Abbot.

To say that they take away a part of Christs mediation, is no slander but truth, as by M. Bishop himselfe appeareth in this very place. To M. Perkins saying that if Christ did sufficiently merit eternall life for vs, then he should do more then is needefull, in making vs able to merit for our selues, he answereth, that though Christs merits be of infinite value, and haue deserued of God all graces and blessings, yet his diuine will and order is, that we also merit that crowne of glory. But to what end when he hath merited it already? Marry not to supply the want of his merits, but as being members of his mysticall body, he would haue vs like vnto himselfe in this point of merriting. Thus we must think that M. Bishop is like vnto Christ in this point of merking, or rather we must think him an impious wretched ma-

thus

thus in meriting to consort himselfe and his with the Sonne of God, and to bring in these prophane nouelties into the Church, which neither Scripture, nor councell, nor father, nor any antiquitie was euer acquainted with. Where hath he euer read, that Christ would *haue vs lik vnto himselfin this point of meriting?* What is this but to affirme him in a kinde of generality, onely to be Iesus Christ, but that otherwise he hath left it to euery man to be a Iesus Christ, a Redeemer and Sauiour for himselfe, because *it is his will to haue vs like vnto himselfe in this point of meriting* by which it is that he is become Iesus, and a Sauiour vnto vs? It is by meriting I say, that Christ is vnto vs Iesus a Sauiour, and therefore if we be *like vnto him in meriting*, it cannot be auoided but that we also are Sauiours. Yea, and for this matter of *meriting*, necessary it was that he that should be our Redeemer should be God, because none but God, no Angell, no Archangell, no creature whatsoeuer could merit at the hands of God; and yet this man sticketh not blasphemously to affirme, that in this point of *meriting* we are like vnto the Sonne of God. And all this *meriting* for ought he saith, remaineth still needlesse and causelesse, because for shame he dareth not deny that in words which indeed he doth deny, that *Christs merits are inestimable, and haue deserued all graces and blessings for vs.* Which being graunted, to what end should we be like vnto Christ in meriting? Nay, we rightly conclude thereof, because God doth nothing idlely, that therefore he doth not appoint vs to merit that for our selues, which Christ hath already merited in our behalfe. Whereas he saith, that *God desirous to traine vs vp in all good workes, best knew that there is no better spurre to pricke forward our dull nature, then to ordaine and propose such heauenly rewards*, we acknowledge that so farre he saith truly, but where he addeth that they are proposed to such as wil *endeuour to deserue them*, I must remember him of the sentence of *Marke* the Hermite before alledged, that [a] *some keeping the commandements, expect the Kingdome of heauen as a wages deserued or due vnto them, and that these faile of the Kingdome of heauen.* Now here *M. Bishop* in his brauery sitteth him downe in his chaire, and taketh vpon him to teach *M. Perkins*, as *a man much ignorant in the matter of Christes mediation*, but if *M. Perkins* had knowne it in no better sort then he teacheth him, we might haue taken him indeede for a very simple and ignorant man. True it is

which

* Our conformity and likenesse to Christ wherein it standeth see of satisfaction. Sect. 2.

a *Marc. Heremi. Supra sect. 14.*

which he ſaith that *the office of Chriſts mediation conſiſteth in reconciling man to God, and that he performeth this by paying the ranſom of our ſinnes, by purchaſing Gods fauour, and ordaining meanes how all mankind might attaine to eternall life.* But hee ſaith very vntruly, *that in the two firſt points for the moſt part we agree;* for they are farre from agreeing therein with vs, or with the truth of the Goſpell of Chriſt. They do not hold that *our ſinnes are freely pardoned,* or *that we are freely iuſtified,* albeit he is aſhamed to confeſſe that they hold it otherwiſe. For what is it to ſay *freely*, but b*for nothing*, as his Rhemiſh Maiſters haue expounded it? and they doe not hold that our ſinnes are pardoned, or we iuſtified for nothing, but for works. And that appeareth by that he addeth next: *although wee require other preparation then they do.* For the workes of *preparation* they make to be the cauſe of the forgiuenes of ſinnes and iuſtification, as he himſelfe hath c before diſputed; onely hee thinketh the matter handſomely ſalued, that works are the cauſe of iuſtification, but not the merit of works, and with this iugling deuice he addeth, that *they as fully deny any merit of ours, to be cauſe thereof as we do.* Whereas the Scripture ſaith nothing of the merit of works, but abſolutely excludeth *workes* from being any part of the cauſe of our iuſtification before God; neither oppoſeth each to other *grace*, and *merits*, but *grace* and *workes*; not ſaying, *If it be of grace it is not of merits*, but d *If it be of grace, it is not of workes, otherwiſe grace were no grace.* Therefore theſe words of his, are but words of hypocriſie and falſhood, and vſed onely to blinde the vnskilfull Reader, and to conceale that venome & poiſon that would otherwiſe eaſily bee eſpied. Albeit his maſter *Bellarmine* ſticketh not to tell vs, that e *faith* which is one of their preparations, *doth iuſtifie by way of merit*, and *doth in ſome ſort merit forgiueneſſe of ſinnes*, that wee may know that very vntruly and againſt his owne knowledge, *M. Biſhop* affirmeth that they as fully deny merit to bee the cauſe of forgiueneſſe of ſinnes or iuſtification, as we do.

b Rhem. Teſtam. explication of words in the end.

c Of Iuſtification. Sect. 21.

d Rom. 11. 6.

e *Bellarm. de iuſtificat. lib. 5. cap. 17. Iuſtificat per modū meriti: ſuo quodam modo meretur remiſſionē peccatorum.*

About *the meanes of attaining to heauen*, he ſaith, *we differ altogether. For they ſay*, ſaith he, *that God requireth no iuſtice in vs.* Where as he hath ſought to cleare his owne part with a lye, ſo doth he with a lye ſeeke to diſgrace ours. We do not ſay that *God requireth no iuſtice in vs*; we only deny that the iuſtice which God requireth in vs, is the cauſe of our iuſtification before God, or can yeeld

vs

vs any merit towards God, and therefore in this respect wee desire [f] *to be found in Christ*, and by faith to stand vnder the couerture of his merits and righteousnesse, and in the imputation thereof to be accepted vnto euerlasting life. Now against this hee saith, that *Christs righteousnesse and merits are not communicable vnto anie meere creature.* But he saith he knowth not what; for what should hinder but that what Christ hath done for vs, should bee communicated and imputed vnto vs? And is not Christ himselfe communicated vnto vs, [g] *borne vnto vs, giuen vnto vs*, become [h] *one with vs*? Accordingly therefore hee is [i] *of God made righteousnesse vnto vs*, euen [k] *the Lord our righteousnesse*, that we may say, [l] *I will go forth in the strength of the Lord God, and will make mention of thy righteousnesse onely.* But he will haue it, that *through Christs merits grace is giuen vnto vs to do good workes, and to merit eternall life.* One part whereof we acknowledge to be true, that through Christs merits grace is giuen vnto vs to doe good works, because good works are the way wherein we are to walke to that eternall life which hee hath merited and purchased for vs. But the other part thereof is false, and we denie that he hath appointed vs by our good workes to merit for our selues eternall life. It is a Romish fancie, which we maruell they so busie themselues to cōmend to others, when none of them dare presume of it in himselfe. *M. Perkins* by sound argument hath confuted it, and *M. Bishop* is content againe barely to affirme it, without either proofe of his owne part, or disproofe of that that is said against it. In a word, wee doe not find in Scripture that Christ died for our good workes that they might merit, but only for our sinnes that they might bee pardoned. This is the ancient receiued faith of the Church of Christ, but the other is a nouelty which antiquity neuer imagined, but is lately deuised in the Church of Rome. He saith that they by this doctrine of Merits, do *much more magnifie Gods grace and Christs merits then we doe.* And why? *For the greater the gift is*, saith he, *the greater is the glory of the giuer.* But I answer him that the gift is greater, in that Christ giueth himselfe to be our merit and righteousnes, then it should be in giuing vs ableneſse to merit for our selues. And by this the glory of the giuer is most of all set forth, which then most clearely shineth, when there is least shew or appearance of any thing to be attributed vnto vs. Which is not in their popish doctrine, where man by his

[f] Phil. 3. 9.

[g] Esa. 9. 6.
[h] Ioh. 17. 23.
[i] 1. Cor. 1. 30.
[k] Ierem. 23. 6.
[l] Psalm. 71. 14.

his merits is set on horsebacke, and those merits are affirmed so to proceede from grace, as that they proceed also in part from his owne free will. Therefore to denie our merits, is not to vndermine and blow out the vertue of Christs merits, but to acknowledge the same to bee in themselues entirely and perfectly sufficient without vs, that whilest we yeeld nothing to our selues to reioyce in, the glory of our saluation may redound wholly to him to whom wholy and onely it doth belong. But to affirme merits on our part, cannot be without singular derogation to the mediation and merits of Christ, who hath taught vs to apply vnto vs the vertue of his merits, not by meriting againe for our selues, but by beleeuing in him, according to that which the Apostle hath taught vs, that God hath [m] *set him forth to be an attonement (for vs) through faith in his blood.*

m Rom. 3. 25.

*M. Perkins* against this vaine presumption of merit, alledgeth further, that for one good work that we do, we haue many euill, the offence whereof defaceth the merit of our best deedes, and maketh them too light in the ballance of the law. This *M. Bishop* lightly regardeth. Tush his mortall sinnes are taken away by penance, and his merits though they were gone, yet returne againe, and without doubt he wil thereof make himselfe a ladder that shall serue him to climbe to heauen. *What*, saith he, *must wee not speake of good, because we may hap to do euill? That is a faire perswasion, and wel worthy of a wise man.* It is but a hap we must thinke that he doth any euill, and therefore he will not be barred from speaking of his good, and is no foole I warrant you in the perswasion thereof. Surely we thinke that *Iob* was somewhat wiser then *M. Bishop*, and yet he thought that perswasion not to bee vnworthy of him. [n] *If I would contend with him, I should not be able to answer him one for a thousand.* And when by the prouocation of his friends he had vsed that great iustification of himselfe, being reproued for it by the Lord, he renounceth to speake of his good any more, and saith, [o] *I am vile: what shall I answere thee? I will lay my hand vpon my mouth. Once haue I spoken, but I will answer no more, yea twise, but I will proceede no further.* Dauid [p] *seeing the whole life of man in a manner on euery side to be barked at by his sinnes*, thought his euils sufficient to stop his mouth from talking of his good, and crieth out vnto God, [q] *O Lord if thou straitly marke iniquities, who can stand?*

n Iob. 9. 2.

o Iob. 39. 37.

p *Aug. in Psal. 129. Videt propè totam vitam humanam circumlatrari peccatis suis.*

q Psal. 130. 2.

*S. Austine*

*S. Austine* thought it worth the while to consider, and tooke it to be a barre against all pleading of Merit, that if God strictly examine our behauiour, [r] *hee shall find more sinnes then merits or good workes*: and therefore he could cry out, [s] *Woe euen to the commendable life of man, if thou, O God, examine it without mercy.* I wonder then what merit *M. Bishop* can find in the commendable life of man. The same *S. Austine* asketh againe, [t] *Who is hee that is not a debter vnto God, but he onely in whom can no sinne bee found?* Now if we bee all debters vnto God by our sinnes, can wee by our good workes haue him a debter vnto vs? And what though God of his meere mercy and goodnesse do pardon our sinnes, and putting out of sight and remembrance our euill deeds, do still reserue the acknowledgment of our well-doings? Shall we thereupon out of his mercy build a merit vnto our selues, and thinke that wee haue well deserued at Gods hands, and bound him to vs by our good deeds, when by our sinnes we haue a thousand times more prouoked him to destroy vs? *M. Bishop* is no doubt a wise man, and hath some great reason to settle himselfe in this perswasion; but yet a fool may be so wise, as to wish him to take heede that the golden house of merits that he buildeth now, do not fall heauie in the end vpon his owne head.

r *August. Plura inuenit peccata quam merita.*

s *Confess. lib 9. ca. 13. Faciam laudabili vitæ hominum si remota misericordia discutias eam.*

t *De verb. Dom. ser. 15. Quis est qui non sit debitor Dei nisi in quo nullum potest inuenire peccatum?*

## 17. W. Bishop.

*Let vs to our third Argument; God hath by couenant and promise bound himselfe to reward our workes with life euerlasting: Therefore good works doe in iustice deserue it: for faithfull promise maketh due debt. The couenant is plainely set downe: where God in the person of an housholder agreeth with his workemen for a penny a day: that is, to giue them life euerlasting for trauailing in his seruice during their life time, as all ancient interpreters expound it. Whereupon S. Paul inferreth, that God should be vniust, if hee should forget their works, who suffered persecution for him: and saith, If it be iust with God to render tribulation to them that persecute you, and to such as are persecuted, rest with vs: vpon the same ground S. Hierome saith, Great truely were the iniustice of God, if he did punish euill works, and would not as well receiue good workes. To all these, and much more such like, M. Perkins answereth, that couenant for workes was in the old Testament, but*

Math. 20.

Heb. 6.

2. Thess. 1.

Li. 2. cont. Iouin. cap. 3.

UMI

*but in the new, the covenant is made with the workeman, not with the worke.*

Reply. *All that I cited in this argument, is out of the new Testament where expresse covenant is made for working and workes, as you have heard. And as it was said in the old law,* Do these things & thou shalt live: *so is it said in the new,* If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandements: *and life eternall is the hire and wages for labouring in Gods vineyard, and not of the imputed iustice or merits of Christ: but looke about you and behold the goodly marke which* M. Perkins *sets vp: Marke, saith he, that it is said, God will render vnto every man according to his workes: not to the worke, or for the worke. O sharpe and ouer-fine wit! doth hee render according to the works, and doth he not render for the workes? If the rate of the workes bee the measure of the reward, that for fewer or lesser works there is a lesser reward, and for many and worthier a greater: surely in my simple vnderstanding, hee that giueth according vnto the workes, giueth for the works. That other addle inuention (that workes are there mentioned, not because they are rewarded, but because they are tokens that the doer is in* Christ, *for whose obedience God promiseth the crowne of life) is not worth the confuting, it is so flat contrary to the text: which ascribeth distinctlie that reward vnto the workman for his workes, and not for Christs obedience imputed vnto him.* Math. 19.

## R. Abbot.

*M. Bishop* in the former section, as we haue seene, hath flowted *M. Perkins* with the name of *wise man*, and pronounced his ignorance, and hath taken vpon him to teach him. Now a man would wonder, that taking so much vpon him there, hee should heere argue so childishly and simply as he hath done. *God hath by promise bound himselfe to reward our works with life euerlasting: therefore good works do in iustice deserue it:* But what if some man for a goose quill should premise *M. Bishop* a goose, should not hee bee taken for a goose that would thereupon conclude, that a goose quil were worth a goose? Who would not deride and scorne the absurdity of such men, who set foorth themselues like champions and challengers, and bring such reeds or rather rushes to fight with? What, because God in mercy promiseth to reward our works with life

euerlasting, doth it follow that our workes do deserue the same? *Faithfull promise*, saith he: *maketh due debt*. But what of that? for the debt in that case ariseth not of any desert of him to whom the promise is made, but onely of the word of him that promiseth. A man for nothing may promise something, and for very smal things very great; where though there bee no comparison betwixt the one and the other, yet the promise standeth good. We must therefore distinguish betwixt *debt of desert*, and *debt of promise*. For debt *of desert* ariseth out of the nature and condition of the worke it selfe, which by it selfe bindeth him to whose vse and seruice it is done. But *debt of promise* groweth not from the thing that is done or yeelded to another, but onely from the promise it selfe, whereby a man hath bound himselfe. Saint *Austine* well obserueth, that [a] *it is one thing to say to a man, Thou art debtor to me, because I haue giuen to thee; another thing to say, Thou art debtor to me because thou hast promised me. When thou saiest, Thou art debtor to mee because I haue giuen to thee, a benefit hath proceeded from thee, though by way of lending, not of meere giuing. But when thou saist, Thou art debtor to me because thou hast promised me, thou giuest nothing to him, and yet requirest of him. Where the goodnesse of him that hath promised, will make good that which he hath promised, least fidelity be changed to naughtinesse or euill. For he that deceiueth is naught.* Therefore *debt of promise* we see is so farre from implying or importing desert, as that it bindeth the promiser for his owne sake, though there be nothing in the party to whom hee hath promised that may moue him or giue him cause of the performance of his promise. *The conenant*, he saith, *is set downe, where God in the person of a housholder, agreeth with his workmen for a penny a day, &c.* But that thence no merit can be gathered, hath bene before shewed in [b] answer to the fifft obiection. Yea, and it is plaine; because if there had beene respect of merit, there should to vnequall worke haue beene assigned vnequall reward. But there all are made equall, that all may know, as was before alledged out of *Prosper*, that [c] *they receiue a gift of grace not a wages due to workes*. It is [d] *iust* then *with God*, as Master *Bishop* citeth, not to *forget the worke* of his seruants; [e] *iust with God to render rest to them that are persecuted* for his sake, not in respect of any merit of ours, but for his own word and promise sake. [f] *It is*

a *Aug. de verb. Apost. ser. 16. Aliter dicimus homini, Debes mihi quia deds tibi: aliter dicimus, Debes mihi quia promisisti mihi. Quando dicis, Debes mihi quia dedi tibi, processit à te beneficium sed mutuatum non donatum. Quando dicis, Debes mihi, quia promisisti mihi, tu nihil dedisti & tamen exigis. Bonitas enim eius qui promisit debit ne in malitiam fides conuertatur. Quis autem eos fallit malus est.*

b *Sect. 14.*

c *Prosp. de vocat. gent lib 1. cap. 5. Se donum gratiæ non operum accepisse meminerint.*

d Heb. 6. 10.

e 2. Thes. 1. 6.

f *Ambros. in Rom cap. 3. Iustitia Dei dicta est quia videtur esse misericordia quia de promissione originem habet. & cum promissum Dei redditur, iustitia Dei dicitur. Iustitia enim Dei est quia redditum est quod promissum est.*

called

called the iuſtice of God, ſaith Ambroſe, *which ſeemeth to bee mercie, becauſe it hath his originall from promiſe, and when the promiſe of God is performed, it is called the iuſtice of God. For it is the iuſtice of God that that is paied or performed which is promiſed.* Thus and no otherwiſe is the ſaying of Saint *Hierome* to bee vnderſtoode, that [g] *great ſhould be the vniuſtice of God if he did onely puniſh ſinnes, and did not receiue or accept good works*, namely becauſe as hee hath in iudgement threatned to puniſh the one; ſo hee hath promiſed in mercy to reward the other. Otherwiſe if wee conſider the works themſelues, they are [h] *not ſuch as that God ſhould doe wrong, though hee gaue not vnto them eternall life*, as Saint *Bernard* ſpeaketh, yea ſaith *Hierome*, [i] *All hands ſhall faile at the day of death and iudgement, becauſe no worke ſhall bee found worthy of the iuſtice of God.* The more wickedly deale the Rhemiſh gloſers, in referring thoſe words of *Hierome* to the very merit of workes, not doubting with manifeſt blaſphemy, to affirme that [k] *good workes bee ſo farre meritorious, as that God ſhould be vniuſt, if hee rendred not heauen for the ſame.* But Saint *Auſtine* farre otherwiſe ſaith: [l] *God hath made himſelfe a debtor vnto vs, not by hauing any thing of vs, but by promiſing all things vnto vs.* [m] *He is become a debtor, not by receiuing any thing from vs, but by promiſing what it pleaſed him.* Hereupon ſaith he, that which in ſo many places hee repeateth: [n] *Wee ſay not vnto God, Repay that which thou haſt receiued, but, Pay that which thou haſt promiſed.* Yea, hee plainely argueth, that [o] *ſith wee haue of him whatſoeuer wee offer to him, and all our goodneſſe is of him, therefore wee haue not yeelded any thing to him to hold him debtor thereby. Whence then haue wee him a debtor? Marry*, ſaith hee, *becauſe hee is a promiſer.* See here *Maſter Biſhop*; becauſe all our good workes are of God, wee cannot haue him a debtor vnto vs by any merit of workes that wee doe vnto him, but hee is a debtor onely for his promiſe ſake. [p] *Let vs hold him a moſt faithfull debtor*, ſaith hee, *becauſe wee haue him a moſt mercifull promiſer.* The promiſe was made in mercy; the performance

g Hieron Cont. Iouinian. lib. 2. Ingens grauis iniuſtitia Dei ſi tantum peccata puniret & bona opera non ſuſciperet.

h Bernard in Annunciat. Ser. 3. Non talia ut iniuriam faceret Deus miſ eam dormiret.

i Hieron. in Eſa. lib. 6. cap. 14. Cum Dies iudicij vel dormitionis aduenerit diſſoluentur omnes manus, quia nullum opus digntum Dei iuſtitia reperietur.

k Rhem Teſtam. Annot. Heb. 6. 10.

l Auguſt in Pſal. 109. Debitorem ſe nobis Deus fecit nihil a nobis accipiendo, ſed omnia nobis promittendo.

m Idem. De verb. Apoſt. Ser. 16. Debitor factus eſt non aliquid à nobis accipiendo, ſed quod ei placuit promittendo.

n Idem in Pſal. 32. 83. 109. & de verb. Dom. Ser. 32. Non dicimus illi, Redde quod accepiſti, ſed Redde quod promiſiſti.

o In Pſalm. 32. Cum ab illo habeamus quicquid illa offerimus & ex illo ſit quicquid boni ſumus, &c. ergo non ſi aliquid dedimus & tenemus debitorem. Vnde debitorem? Quia promiſſor eſt.

p Ibid. Teneamus fidelisſimum debitorem, quia habemus miſericordiſſimum promiſſorem.

thereof now dependeth vpon the fidelity of the promiſer, not vpon the merit of the worker, euen as the ſame Saint *Auſtine* ſaith;

q *In Pſalm.88. Non ſecundum merita noſtra ſed ſecundum miſericordiam illius firma eſt promiſſio*

q *The promiſe is ſure, not according to our merits, but according to his mercie.*

But to the obiection here made, *M. Perkins* anſwereth by diſtinguiſhing the couenant & promiſe of God, that one is of the Law, another of the Goſpell: one of workes, the other of faith: one of the old Teſtament, the other of the new. By the old couenant of the Law, the promiſe is made only to the worke, neither is the perſon accepted, but for the works ſake. Now by this couenant God

r Heb.8.9.

r *hath no delight in vs, becauſe we cõtinue not in his couenant* there being none found that perfectly fulfilleth the righteouſnes of the law. By the new couenãt the perſon is firſt accepted by faith for Chriſts ſake, and then the worke is accepted and rewarded, not for the merit of it ſelfe, but for the condition of the perſon. By the firſt couenant, the worke is reiected, if it haue not the vttermoſt that it

s 2.Cor.8.12.

ought to haue. By the ſecond couenant, s *if there be firſt a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, not according to that that hee hath not*; ſo that though there be by humane frailtie ſome imperfection in the worke, yet God pardoning the imperfection, accepteth of it, and rewardeth it, dealing as Fathers with their children, who accept their good endeauours, when in the works hapely there is nothing woorthy to be reſpected. Heere therefore the promiſes of God properly reſpect the perſon working, and not the deſert or worthineſſe of the worke. But Maiſter *Biſhop* in the height of his ignorance, anſwereth, that all the places by him cited, *are out of the new Teſtament*, vnderſtanding by the *new Teſtament*, the bookes which we call the *new Teſtament*, and the *old Teſtament*, for the bookes that goe vnder that name. Whereas Maſter *Perkins* diſtinguiſheth the *two Teſtaments*, as God himſelfe doth, not by the bookes, but by the matter of the bookes; there being in the books of the old Teſtament, many things that belong to the new, and many things repeated in the books of the new Teſtament, that belong properly to

t Luk.10.28.

the old. Such are the ſentences by Maſter *Biſhop* alledged, t *Do*

u Math.19.17.

*this and thou ſhalt liue:* u *If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the commandements*, though according to his reading he ſo citeth the former of them out of the old Teſtament, as if it were not ſpoken

in

in the new. But theſe, though by occaſion they be mentioned in the Goſpell, yet are conditions indeede properly belonging to the Law. Now in the old teſtament according to *M. Biſhops* meaning, we may ſee example of that that *M. Perkins* ſaith, where it is ſaid of *Cain* and *Abel*; x *The Lord had a reſpect to* Abel *and his offering, but to* Cain *and his offering he had no regard.* Firſt he had reſpect to *Abel*, becauſe of *his faith* in Chriſt, and conſequently to his offering: but he had no reſpect to *Cain* being voide of true faith, and therefore he had no reſpect to *Cains* offering. For it is here true which the Law ſaith, *Cuius perſona non placet, nec catera placent: where the perſon is not pleaſing, nothing elſe can pleaſe*; and therefore *S. Bernard* ſaith; y *What wondereſt thou* Cain, *that he hath no reſpect to thy gifts who diſpiſeth thee?* Wherfore it ſhould not ſeeme ſtrange to *M. Biſhop* which *M. Perkins* hath obſerued, that God rendering to the faithfull according to their workes, ſhould be ſaid notwithſtanding not to do it for their works ſake, becauſe their works are ſecondarily accepted for their owne ſakes, & they are accepted for Chriſts ſake, and both they and their workes are rewarded by vertue of that attonement; whereby he hath reconciled them vnto God. And thus howſoeuer Maſter *Biſhops* ſimple vnderſtanding conceiueth it not, greater workes haue greater reward and leſſer workes haue leſſer reward, and yet for Chriſtes ſake it is that greater or leſſer haue either greater or leſſe reward. But it is further demaunded, if workes do not merit, why are they mentioned in the promiſes? *Not becauſe they merit*, ſaith Maſter *Perkins*, but Maſter *Biſhop* repeateth it, *Not becauſe they are rewarded*, whereas Maſter *Perkins* denieth not, but that workes are rewarded; onely he denieth that they are rewarded by vertue of their owne merit and worth, but by vertue of Chriſts mediation, for whoſe ſake they are accepted in the ſight of God. But we muſt not think ſtrangely of this, becauſe he doth therein but as he was woont to do. It is further added, that good workes are mentioned in the promiſes, as the proper markes and ſignes of them to whom appertaine the promiſes that are made freely for Chriſts ſake: as tokens that the doer of them is in Chriſt, through whoſe merits the promiſe ſhall be accompliſhed. This to *M. Biſhop* is an *addle inuention, not woorth the confuting, it is ſo flat contrary to the text*. But it is his addle head that taketh this for an addle inuention, and his ignorance of

x Geneſ. 4. 4, 5.

y Bernard. in Cant. Ser. 24. *Quid mireris ô Cain quòd munera tua non reſpicit qui te deſpicis?*

the text that maketh him thinke it ſo flat contrary to the text. The *text*, ſaith he, *aſcribeth diſtinctly that reward vnto the workeman for his works, and not for Chriſts obedience imputed vnto him* But we tell him againe, that it is for the imputation of Chriſts obedience, that the text aſcribeth any reward to the workman for his worke, as is ſufficiently approoued vnto him in the [z] defence of the anſwer to the firſt obiection. His whole errour ſtandeth in this, that he cannot conceiue how the reward ſhould be giuen to our workes, if it be giuen for Chriſts ſake, or how it ſhould be giuen for Chriſts ſake, if it be promiſed to our workes, whereas both theſe accord in one, and for Chriſts ſake it is that any ſuch reward is aſſigned to our workes.

z *Supra. Sect.* 14.

## 18. W. Bishop.

M. Perkins *fourth obiection for vs is propoſed vnskilfully, yet could he not anſwer it, but by relying vpon that which is moſt vntrue, that* forſooth *no one action of the beſt man is without fault: which hath bene already confuted, and might be by inſtances of* Abrahams *oblation of his ſonne, Saint* Iohn Bapiſts *preaching, and reprehending of* Herod, *and* Stephens *martyrdome, with infinite ſuch like, in which* Maſter Perkins *nor any elſe will be able to ſhew in particular, what fault there was. Againe, our Sauiour ſaith*: That if the eye be ſimple, the whole body is lightſome, not hauing any part of darkneſſe in it: *and very reaſon teacheth vs, that a mans action for ſubſtance and all due circumſtances, may be perfect. It was then a very ſilly ſhift to ſay, that neuer any man did any one action, with all his due circumſtances.*

Math. 6. Luk. 11.

*But inſteede of that fourth Argument, I will put this: If a greater reward be due vnto them that do better workes, then a reward is due vnto them that do good workes, which is euident in reaſon: But a greater reward is prouided for them that do better, as S.* Auguſtine *grounded vpon Gods word, proued in ſundry places: namely vpon that,* For ſtarre differeth from ſtarre in glory, ſo ſhall be the reſurrection of the dead: ſpecifying that virginity ſhall ſhine after one ſort, chaſtitie in wedlocke after another, and holy widowhood yet after another: all (*ſaith he*) ſhall be there, but they ſhine diuerſly: *And of the ſame worke affirmeth,* That martyrdome ſhall be higher rewarded then

*Serm. 46. De verbis Dom.* 1. Cor. 15.

*Serm. 95. Lib. de virg. cap. 44.*

then any other worke. *The like doth he vpon thoſe words,* One ground ſhall yeeld thirty fold, another threeſcore fold, another an hundred fold: Comparing chaſtitie in wedlocke to thirty, in widowes to the ſixty, and in virgins to the hundred. *But moſt directly in his ſixty ſeauen treatiſe vpon Saint* Iohns *Goſpell, vpon this verſe:* In my Fathers houſe are many manſions: *where he ſaith, that albeit ſome bee holier, iuſter, and more valiant then others, yet there ſhall be fit roomes for them all, where euerie one is to receiue his place according vnto his merit. That penny ſpoken of (by which ſaith he is ſignified eternall life)* Mat. 20. *ſhall be giuen to euery man equally: becauſe euery one ſhall liue for euer, and not one longer then another: but many manſions do ſignifie the different dignities of merits in the ſame euerlaſting life.*

*And* S. Gregory *in moſt expreſſe termes, doth teach the ſame doctrine, ſaying:* Becauſe in this life there is a difference of workes amongs vs, there ſhall be in the other life without all doubt a diſtinction of dignities: that as one here exceedeth another in merit, ſo there one ſurpaſſeth another in reward. *Finally,* S. Auguſtine, *and* S. Hierome, *condemne it as an hereſie, to hold there is not diuerſity of merits in this life, and rewards in the next: Whereon followeth moſt manifeſtly, that there be merits and rewards.* Lib. 4. mor. cap. 42. De hereſ. her. 82. Lib. 2. cont. Ioui.

## R. Abbot.

The fourth obiection he telleth vs is *vnskilfully propoſed,* but yet he doth not tell vs how he would haue it propoſed, becauſe belike hee had ſmall opinion of it. Yet I will doe him the fauour to put it into forme for him, to let it appeare whether hee bee likely of any aduantage by it. It muſt be thus: If good workes bee perfect and without fault, then they merite. But they are perfect and without fault, becauſe they are the workes of the holy Ghoſt. Therefore they muſt needes merite. Now the firſt of theſe propoſitions is falſe. For although it bee granted that good workes bee perfect and without any defect, yet can they not merite at Gods hands, as may appeare by that that hath beene [a] before ſaid as touching the conditions of Merite. Euen *Adam* himſelfe in the ſtate of Paradiſe, could by deſert haue challenged nothing at Gods hands, as neither canne the elect Angels ſtill continuing in that integritie wherein they were firſt created. But Maſter *Perkins* denieth

[a] *Supra, Sect. 4.*

the *minor* propoſition, affirming that no workes of ours are perfect and without blemiſh, but doe all carie the markes of our vncleanneſſe, whereby beeing exacted in rigour, they are ſubiect to reproofe. For although in their originall, which is the ſpirit of God, they bee pure and cleane, yet as water though cleere in the fountaine, yet gathereth vncleanneſſe from the channell wherein it runneth, ſo the workes of grace wrought in vs, doe receiue ſome taint of the corruptiō of our nature through which they paſſe. And as the hand of the moſt cunning Scribe, write hee neuer ſo excellently by himſelfe, loſeth much of his perfection and grace, in holding the hand of a childe to teach him to write, ſo the worke of the holy Ghoſt beeing moſt abſolute in it ſelfe, yet in vs through the crookednеſſe and corruption of our nature, whileſt it is framing vs to it ſelfe, loſeth much of the beautie and glorie that it ſhould haue, vntil the ſame ſpirit haue fully conſumed all our droſſe, that it alone may preuaile in vs. *M. Biſhop* replieth, that *this is moſt vntrue*, and telleth vs, that *it hath beene already confuted*, but yet againſt his confutation it is iuſtified to him before, and will ſtand good, that there is no action of man ſo perfect, but that there is a defect to bee found in it. The beſt of our actions is weakned by [b] *the fleſh luſting againſt the ſpirit, ſo as that we cannot do the things that we would.* In our beſt actions it hapneth which our Sauiour ſaith; [c] *The ſpirit indeede is willing, but the fleſh is weake.* And howſoeuer faith fighting againſt the weakeneſſe of the fleſh, do preuaile and ouercome, yet euen of the reſiſtance of the fleſh there groweth a blemiſh, and the neereneſſe of the infection thereof, doth breath out ſome diſtaſtfull quality vpon our workes, for which wee haue neede to aske pardon at Gods hands. But *M. Biſhop* bringeth inſtances of *Abrahams* oblation of his ſonne; of *Iohn Baptiſts* preaching and reprehending *Herod*; of his and *Steuens* martyrdome, *with infinite other ſuch like*, ſaith hee, *in which no man can ſhew in particular what fault there was.* But why ſhould we not conceiue the like of the martyrdom of *Iohn* and *Steuen*, as wee doe of the martyrdome of *Peter*? And of *Peters* martyrdome our Sauiour Chriſt beforehand ſaith; [d] *When thou ſhalt bee old, thou ſhalt ſtretch forth thine hands, and another ſhall gird and leade thee whither thou wouldeſt not. Thus ſpake he*, ſaith S. Iohn, *ſignifying by what death he ſhould glorifie God.* Where when he ſaith, *Whither thou wouldeſt not*, there is plainely approued in *Peters* martyrdome,

b Gal 5.17.

c Mat.26.41.

d Joh.21.18.

tyrdome a ſhrinking and drawing backe, a reſiſtance and oppoſition of the will, ſo that though willingly he did vndergoe it, yet it was in ſome part alſo againſt his will. Whereupon *S. Auſtine* maketh this collection: [e] *If Peter the Apoſtle being of ſo great perfection, was led whither hee would not, and died with his will againſt his will, but with his will receiued the crowne, what maruell is it if there bee ſome feare in the ſuffering euen of iuſt men, euen of the Saints? There is feare by humane infirmity, and hope by the promiſe of God.* And this reſiſtance, this feare, this ſhrinking backe, the ſame *S. Auſtine* imputeth to the corruption of ſinne. [f] *A man* (ſaith hee) *in mind ſeruing the law of God, and in the fleſh carying ſtill the luſts of ſinne, which the Apoſtle forbiddeth to obey, by reaſon of the mind deſireth indeede to bee looſed, and to be with Chriſt, but by ſenſe of the fleſh refuſeth and ſhunneth it.* Now what ground hath *M. Biſhop* to except *Iohn* and *Stephen* in their martyrdome from the cõmon condition of the Saints? and why ſhould he thinke that *Iohns* preaching and reprehending of *Herod* was without that ſpotte of reſiſtance and feare, when his martyrdom was not? And why ſhould we imagine, that that weakneſſe of the fleſh which hath his worke in the martyrdome of the Saints, had not the like alſo in *Abrahams* oblation of his ſon, being a thing without doubt as croſſe to his nature and will, as his owne death was. But ſaith *M. Biſhop, Our Sauiour ſaith, that* [g] *if the eie be ſimple, the whole body is light ſome, not hauing any part of darkneſſe in it.* It is true, if the eie bee wholly ſingle and cleere, but where is the eie that is ſo cleere? Where is hee that ſaith not with *Dauid* [h] *Lighten mine eies that I ſleepe not in death.* [i] *Open thou mine eies, that I may ſee the wondrous things of thy Law.* [k] *It is our owne worke or indeuour in this life,* ſaith *S. Auſtine, to heale the eie of the heart wherewith we ſhould ſee God.* If it be our *whole worke in this life* to heale our eies, then wee expect not in this life to haue them fully whole. In the meane while therefore becauſe it is Gods prerogatiue which *S. Iohn* ſpeaketh of, [l] *God is light, and in him is no darkeneſſe at all,* it muſt needes bee, as *S. Hierome* collecteth thereof, [m] *that all our lights are ſpotted and darkened with ſome filth.* But hee telleth vs yet further, that *very reaſon teacheth vs, that a mans action for ſubſtance, and all due circumſtances may be perfect.* And it may be indeed that his broken reaſon ſo teacheth him, howſoeuer his conſcience bee contrarie to his reaſon. But our reaſon teacheth vs, that if there bee

yet

e *Aug. in Pſa. 30. conc. 1. S. Petrus Apoſtolus tanta perfectione quo nollet ductus eſt, & volens nolens mortuus eſt, ſed volens coronatus eſt, quid mirum ſi eſt aliquis pauor in paſſione etiam iuſtorum, etiam Sanctorum. Pauor eſt ex humana infirmitate, ſpes ex diuina promiſſione.*

f *Idem Epiſt. 120. Mente ſeruiens legi Dei, carne autem trahens deſideria peccati, quibus obedire vetat Apoſtolus; mentis quidem ratione concupiſcit homo diſſolui & eſſe cũ Chriſto, ſed id ſenſu carnis recuſat & refugit.*

g Mat 6.22. Luk. 11.34.

h Pſal. 13.3.

i Pſal. 119.18.

k *Aug. in verb. Dom. ſer. 18. Tota opera noſtra in hac vita eſt ſanare oculum cordis vnde videtur Deus.*

l 1. Ioh. 1.5.

m *Hieron. contr. Pelag. li. 2. Quando dicit nullas tenebras in Dei lumine reperiri, oſtendit omnia aliorum lumina ſorde aliqua maculari.*

yet darkeneſſe in the vnderſtanding, and waiwardneſſe in the will, and in both a ſtooping and inclining to the weakneſſe and corruption of the fleſh, as indeede there is, then all our workes ſauour of our earthly veſſels, and nothing can come from vs, but certainely carieth a blot and imperfection with it. And therefore it was no ſilly ſhift of *M. Perkins*, but a true defence, that neuer any man did any one action with all his due circumſtances, becauſe [n] *all the ſoule* which God wholly requireth in euerie action of his ſeruice, cannot bee wholly beſtowed therein, ſo long as concupiſcence poſſeſſeth any part thereof, as perpetually it doth ſo long as wee continue in the warfare of this life. But heere in ſtead of that fourth obiection propoſed by *M. Perkins*, *M. Biſhop* bringeth vs foorth a leaden dagger of his owne. *If greater reward bee due vnto them that doe better workes, then a reward is due vnto them that do good works. But a greater reward is prouided for them that do better workes*: the concluſion ſhould be, *Therefore a reward is due vnto them that doe good workes.* Inſtead wherof in the end of this idle diſcourſe, he bringeth in this: *Whereof followeth moſt manifeſtly, that there bee merites and rewards.* But I pray you *M. Biſhop*, whereof doth that follow? do *merits* follow in the concluſion, when in the premiſſes there is no mention of thē? But we muſt pardon you: it ſeemeth your trauelling to Rome hath iogged your Logicke out of your head, and therefore ſuch concluſions may eaſily ſlippe you. But the direct concluſion of your argument we grant, *therefore a reward is due vnto them that doe good workes*, onely with this exception, that it is due by the merciſull promiſe of God, not by vertue of any our merit or deſert, and more your argument prooueth not. Now hee taketh great paines in the handling of this worthy argument, to proue inequalitie of reward, and all to no purpoſe, becauſe wee deny not, but that as God in this life diuerſly diſtributeth his graces, to ſome in greater meaſure, to ſome in leſſe: ſo in the life to come hee will ſort his rewards accordingly, that it may bee true which is written, that [o] *euery man ſhall receiue his wages according to his labour*. But whether greater wages to greater labour, or leſſer wages to leſſer labour, both are promiſed for Chriſts ſake, as hath been ſhewed: and God will performe the ſame [p] *for his owne names ſake*, and not for any merite of ours, whereby hee ſtandeth bound vnto vs. As for the terme of *merits* which hee alledgeth out of the Fathers, what wee are to conceiue thereof

n Deut. 6. 5. *Aug. de perfect. iuſtit. Cum eſt aliquid concupiſcentiæ carnalis, quod hæc continendo frenatur, non omnimodo ex tota anima diligitur Deus.*

o 1. Cor. 3. 8.

p Ezech. 36. 22.

thereof followeth anone after to be declared. Of virginity and widowhood we are to intreat in the queſtion of *Vowes*.

## 19. W. BISHOP.

*The firſt reaſon is taken out of thoſe texts, which teach that men are worthy of eternall life:* They ſhall walke with me in whites, becauſe they be worthy. God proued them, & found them worthy of himſelfe. That you may be eſteemed worthy of the kingdome of God. *Now if men be worthy of eternall life, it muſt needs be granted, that they haue deſerued it.* Apoc.3. Sap.3. 2.Theſſ.1. Luk.20.35.

M. Perkins *anſwereth: that they were indeed worthy, but not for their owne merits, but for Chriſts imputed vnto them. This is his onely refuge, yet hath he not, nor cannot ſhew any one text in Scripture that ſpeaketh ſo. But to refell him, turne onely to the places, and there you ſhal find, that this worthineſſe roſe of good workes, as Chriſt ſaith:* I know thy workes, and find them not full: yet there be ſome amongſt you, who haue not defiled their garments (*but haue their works full*) they ſhall walke with me in whites, becauſe they be worthy: *and* by ſuſtaining perſecutions, they were made worthy of that kingdome. *And in the words following the Apoſtle ſignifieth, that it is as iuſt for God to requite good workes with the ioyes of heauen, as he doth puniſh wicked with the paines of hell.* Apoc.3. 2 Theſſ.1.

## R. ABBOT.

*M. Perkins* for obiection propoſeth the place of the Reuelation, [a] *They ſhall walke with me in white, for they are worthy,* as whereby they would proue *merit*, becauſe a man cannot be worthy but he muſt merit and deſerue. *M. Biſhop* out of his ſtore addeth two other places of the new Teſtament, but they are ſuch as whereby is miniſtred vnto vs a very ready and pregnant anſwer to the firſt. The place of *Saint Luke* is by their owne vulgar tranſlation thus: [b] *Qui digni habebuntur*: that is, *They who ſhall be accounted worthy.* The words of *Saint Paul* are: [c] *Vt digni habeamini*: *that ye may be eſteemed worthie of the kingdome*. Whereby we conceiue and vnderſtand what mans worthineſſe is, Gods dignation, Gods acceptatiõ, Gods vouchſafing to take him as worthy for Chriſts ſake though [a] Apoc.3.4. [b] Luk.20.35. [c] 2.Theſſ.1.5.

though in reſpect of himſelfe he be not worthy. To this *M. Biſhop* ſaith *This is his onely refuge, yet can he not ſhew any one text of Scripture that ſpeaketh ſo.* But we anſwer him, that all thoſe texts of Scripture which do thus ſpeake of God, *reputing, or eſteeming, or accounting worthy*, do import ſo much vnto vs. For if our worthines ſtand in Gods eſteeming and accounting of vs, we may not of the little of worthineſſe conclude, that by perfection of reall qualitie we are that for which he is content in mercy and fauor to accept vs. We are accordingly worthie as we are iuſt. We are iuſt, to ſpeake of perfect iuſtice, not by righteouſneſſe of workes, but onely by Gods imputation of righteouſneſſe without workes, as we haue ſeene before. In like ſort therefore we are worthy [d] *by Gods vouchſafing acceptance, not by our worthineſſe*, as *S. Bernard* ſaith. And hereto agree the confeſſions of the faithfull. *Iacob* ſaith, [e] *I am leſſe then all thy mercies, and all the truth which thou haſt ſhewed vnto thy ſeruant*: that is, as we reade it, *I am not worthy thereof*: according to that which *Chryſoſtome* ſaith: [f] *Though we dye a thouſand deaths, though we fulfill all the vertues of the ſoule, yet do we nothing worthy in compariſon of thoſe things which we our ſelues haue receiued of God.* Iohn Baptiſt, [g] *then whom there aroſe not a greater amongſt womens children*, yet ſaith of himſelfe in reſpect of Chriſt, [h] *I am not worthie to beare his ſhoes*: [i] *I am not worthy to vnty the latchet of his ſhoe.* The Centurion of whoſe faith our Sauiour teſtifieth, that [k] *he had not found ſo great faith, no not in Iſrael*, yet ſaith of himſelfe, [l] *I am not worthy that thou ſhouldeſt come vnder my roofe.* [m] *Reade, O man*, ſaith *S. Bernard, in thine owne heart, reade within thy ſelfe concerning thy ſelfe the witneſſe of truth, and thou wilt iudge thy ſelfe vnworthy of this common light.* Thus holy men haue ſpoken, thus they haue thought, and if our vnworthineſſe be ſuch to theſe things, ſhall we dreame of a worthineſſe to the crowne of heauen? [n] *Saue me*, ſaith *Dauid, for thy mercies ſake: that is*, ſaith *S. Auſtine*, [o] *not in my righteouſnes, not in my merits, but in thy mercie: not becauſe I am worthy, but becauſe thou art mercyfull.* Againe, the ſame *S. Auſtine* ſaith in another place: [p] *God yeeldeth vnto vs all good things becauſe he is good, not becauſe we are worthy, becauſe he is mercifull, not becauſe we haue merited in any thing.* The Prophet acknowledgeth God giueth deliuerance [q] *for his mercies ſake*, or as the vulger Latine readeth, *for his*

d Bernard in Dedicat. Eccleſ. ſer. 5. Nos ſumus ſed ipſius dignatione, non dignitate noſtra.
e Gen. 32. 10.
f Chryſoſtom. de compunct. cordis. Et ſi millies moriamur, et ſi omnes animæ virtutes expleamus nihil tamen dignum gerimus ad ea quæ ipſi à Deo percepimus.
g Mat. 11. 11.
h Mat. 3. 11.
i Mar. 1. 7.
k Mat. 8. 10.
l Ver. 8.
m Bernard. in Dedicat. Eccleſ. Ser. 5. Lege, ô homo, in corde tuo, lege intra teipſum de teipſo teſtimonia veritatis, & hac communi luce iudicabis te indignum
n Pſal. 31. 16.
o Aug. in Pſal. 30. Hoc eſt, non in mea iuſticia, non in meis meritis, ſed in tua miſericordia; non quia ego ſum dignus, ſed quia tu miſericors.
p Idem in Pſal. 41. Nobis Deus omnia bona præſtat, quia bonus eſt, non quia nos digni ſumus: quia ille miſericors eſt, non quia in aliquo promeruimus.
q Pſal. 44. 26.

names

*names sake* Saint *Austin* againe expoundeth it: [r] *That is freely, for thy names sake, not for my merit: because thou shalt vouchsafe to doe it, not because I am worthy to whom thou shouldest doe it.* Thus doth *S. Austine* oftentimes giue checke to *M. Bishops* conceipt of worthinesse, by occasion of those phrases so often vsed, *for thy names sake, for thy mercies sake, for thy righteousnesse sake.* So *Basil* expoundeth the same phrase: [s] *For thy mercies sake:* [t] *not because I am worthy, but because of thine owne goodnesse.* Now if *M. Bishop* will haue no saluatiō but that he will be worthy of it, let him hear what *S. Bernard* saith: [u] *If we of childish stomack will not be saued freely, in vaine are wee not saued at all. The dissembling of our misery excludeth mercy, neither hath Gods vouchsafing any place where presumption is of our worthines.*

But *M. Bishop* to refel *M. Perkins*, biddeth vs *turne to the places, and there we shall find, that the worthinesse rose of workes.* But we haue turned to the places, and find no necessity thereof. Wee find that they that *defiled not their garments were worthy*, but that by their very workes they were worthy we find not. Nay their worthines indeed was in their garments. For what *garments* were they that they had not *defiled*, but the same wherof the Apostle speaketh: [x] *so many as are baptized into Christ, haue put on Christ.* He is our *purple garment* of redemption by his bloud: he is our *Lilly white garment* of innocency by his righteousnesse. They that with this profession of Christ doe ioyne idolatry, heresie, vncleannesse, do dishonour the name and profession of Christ, and disgrace the garments which should grace them; which these had not done. By these garments therefore they were *worthy*, by Christ, by his merits, by his obedience, by his righteousnesse in him and for his sake they were counted worthy, and whatsoeuer worthines God pronounceth of them for their works, it is by the gracious acceptation therof in him. Albeit the place may very well beare another construction also that *they were worthy*, not absolutely, but compared to the other spoken of before. For one man compared to another, may be called *worthy* in comparison of the other, when simply considered in himselfe, & compared to the iudgement of God, he is not worthy. And to this distinctiō *S. Ambrose* leadeth vs, who speaking of the calling of the Apostles, whom Christ put y *in his stead to beseech vs to be reconciled vnto God*, saith of them: [z] *If we enquire the matter strictly, there can no man be found worthy to be the deputy of Christ: for all whom hee chose,*

r *Aug. in Psal. 43. Hoc est gratu, propter nomen tuum, non propter meritū meū, quia tua dignatum es facere, non quia ego dignus sum cui facias.*

s Psal. 142. 12.

t *Basil. in Ps. 142. Non quod ego dignus sim, sed propter benignitatem tuam.*

u *Bernard. in Dedicat. Eccles. Ser. 5 Quid si nos pueriliter animo sate gratis saluari voluimus merito non saluamur. Excludit misericordiā dissimulatio miserationi nec dignatio locum habet, vbi fuerit præsumptio dignitatis.*

x Gal. 3. 27.

y 2. Cor. 5. 20.

z *Ambros. in 2. Tim. 1. Si ad singulorum quorumque vitam nullus hominum potest dignus inueniri Vicarius esse Christi. Omnes enim quos elegit, prius fuerant peccatores. Quantum ergo ad comparationem cæterorum hominum, hi digni inuenti sunt, quibus verbū ad reconciliandum committeretur: quantum verò ad rem ipsam omnes indigni sunt.*

were

were formerly sinners. In comparison thē of others, these (the Apostles) were found worthy; but as touching the thing it selfe all are vnworthy. Thus plainely doth he giue vs to vnderstand, that men may be called worthy only in respect of other men. In the other place *M. Bishop* saith, that *by sustaining persecutions*, they are said *to be made worthie*. But he saith vntruly: for the Apostle saith onely, as was before alledged, *that ye may bee counted worthy*, which (as I haue said) is for Christs sake, [a] *in whom it is giuen vnto vs, that not onely we should beleeue in him, but also suffer for his sake*, and because it is giuen vs, therefore howsoeuer *patiently we beare it*, yet we must still say as *S. Austin* teacheth: [b] *Deliuer vs, not for our merit, but for thy names sake*. Yet hee goeth further and telleth vs, that *in the words following the Apostle signifieth, that it is as iust with God to requite good works with the ioyes of heauen, as to punish wicked with the paines of hell*. Neither do we make any doubt thereof, because he hath giuen his word & promise so to do. And it is as iust with God to perform his promise to the one, as it is to punish the euill deseruings of the other. By iustice and iust iudgement, God giueth rest vnto the persecuted, but this iust iudgement consisteth in iustifying and maintaining [c] *their cause*, as *S. Austin* noteth not in weying or examining their merits worth. By iust iudgement God putteth difference [d] *betwixt the conuerted and the not conuerted; betwixt the righteous and the wicked; betwixt him that serueth God, and him that serueth him not, betwixt him that beleeueth, and him that beleeueth not*; and yet he that beleeueth and serueth God, yea and is persecuted for Gods sake, must craue *iudgement with mercy* to be receiued vnto life, praying with *Dauid* against meere iudgement: [e] *Enter not into iudgement with thy seruāt, &c.* That iustice therfore is to the faithful such as *Basil* speaketh of: [f] *Mercy is mingled with iustice, and so mingled, as that iustice it selfe is called mercie*. That *iust iudgement* is such, as Saint *Ambrose* speaketh of: [g] *A iudgement wherein wee are iudged with consideration of our frailtie, in which, iudgement is ioyned with mercie, so that the truth of iudgement is tempered or qualified with the mercy of the Lord.*

a Phil. 1. 29.

b *Aug. in Psalm. 43. Suae patiuntur in tribulationibus siue gaudent in prosperitatibus redime nos non propter meritum nostrum, sed propter nomen tuum.*

c *Aug. in Psal. 42. Iudica inquit, me Deus: non timeo iudicium tuum quia noui misericordiam tuam. Discerne causam meam, discerne inter eum qui in te credit, & infirmitatem sed dispar conscientia, &c.*

d *Idem in Psal. 32. Nec in misericordia Deus amittit iudicium nec in iudicio misericordiam, &c. Nunquid iudicium amisit aut non debuit iudicare inter conuersos & non conuersos? An vobis iustum videtur vt conuersus, & non conuersus equaliter habeantur? Ergo habet & iudicium in ipsa misericordia. Rursus in illo iudicio habet & misericordiam, &c.*

e Psalm 143. 2.

f *Basil in Psal. 142. Iustitiae immixta est misericordia, & ita immixta vt ipsa iustitia benignitas vocetur.*

g *Ambros. in Psal. 118. Ser. 20. Iudicium quo fragilitatem nostram aestimasse censemur. In hoc ipso iudicium cum misericordia copulatum est, vt veritas iudicij misericordia Domini temperetur.*

Now

Now [b] *iudgement tempered and qualified, is indeed mercie* as Saint *Bernard* saith. As for the place cited out of the booke of *Wisedome*: [i] *God proued them and found them worthy of himselfe*: though it be out of a booke the authoritie whereof we denie, and therefore can require no answer, yet it hath answer sufficient by that that hath bene said. God found them *worthy of himselfe* by finding them answerable to those conditions and rules, by which he is content in mercie to accept men as worthy, though simply no man can be worthy of him.

[b] *Ber. in Cant. Ser. 14. Iudicium temperatum misericordia est.*

[i] *VVisd. 3. 5.*

## 20. W. BISHOP.

*The sixt reason* M. Perkins *deliuereth thus: Eternall life is termed a crowne, and a crowne of righteousnes to be giuen by a iust Iudge: therefore in this life it must be iustly deserued, otherwise it were not wel called a crowne of iustice, nor could be said to be rendred by a iust iudge.* M. Perkins *answereth, that it is called a crowne by resemblance, because it is giuen in the end of the life, as the crowne is giuen in the end of the race.* 2. Tim. 4.

Reply. *If that were all the cause, and that there were no respect to be had to former deserts, it might then as well be called a halter by resemblance, because that also is giuen in the end of life: and in their opinion, more properly, because all their workes are defiled like a menstruous cloth: and a halter is the end of such wicked workes. But as a halter is due to a theefe, so is a crown of glory the iust reward of the righteous man.*

*Secondly he answereth, that it is called a crowne of iustice, because God hath bound himselfe by his promise to giue it: heere then at length we haue by his owne confession, that by Gods promise eternall life is due debt vnto the righteous: but as hauing ouer-shot himselfe, he addes, not for any desert of theirs, but onely for the promise sake. But as you haue heard before out of S.* Matthew, *that promise was made for working the time of his life in our vineyard, and so there was some desert on their part: and the seruants were rewarded, because they employed their talents well: and in this very place, Saint* Paul *reckoneth vp his good seruices, for which the iust iudge would render him a crowne of iustice: and therefore the iustice is not onely in respect of Gods promise. And if* Math. 20. Math. 25.

you

*you will not beleeue mee, proouing that I say out of the very text, vrgeth* thē M. Perkins *on his bare word, let* S. Augustin *be arbitrator betweene vs, who most deepely considereth of euery word in this sentence:* Let vs heare (*saith hee*) the Apostle speaking, when hee approched neare vnto his passion, I haue (*quoth he*) fought a good fight, I haue accomplished my course, I haue kept the faith: concerning the rest, there is laid vp for me a crowne of iustice, which our Lord will render vnto me in that day, a iust iudge: and not only to me, but to thē also that loue his cōming: hee saith, that our Lord a iust iudge will render vnto him a crowne, hee therefore doth owe it, and as a iust iudge will pay it. For the worke being regarded, the reward cannot be denied. I haue fought a good fight, is a worke: I haue accomplished my course, is a worke: I haue kept the faith, is a worke: There is laid vp for me a crowne of iustice, this is the reward. *So that you see most cleerely by this most learned Fathers iudgement, that the reward is due for the worke sake, and not onely for the promise of God. See him vpon that verse of the Psalme:* I will sing vnto thee O Lord, mercy and iudgement. *Where he concludes, that God in iudgement will out of his iustice crowne those good workes, which hee of mercy had giuen grace to do.*

L. 1. ser. Hōm. hom. 4.

Psal. 100.

## R. Abbot.

To the obiection of this place *M. Perkins* answereth, that euerlasting life is called *a crowne* onely in resemblance. *For as hee which runneth a race,* saith he, *must continue and runne to the end, and so be crowned, euen so must we continue to walke in good workes vnto the end, & then receiue eternall life.* Now for reply to this answer it seemeth *M. Bishop* had some conference with the hangman, and learning of him that a halter is the end of a wicked course, (let him remember his owne wicked course, and feare the iudgement of the iust God) he thought good to draw that obseruatiō to serue him for one shift And first to giue way to his hangmans deuice, hee curtalleth *M. Perkins* his answer: as if he had said no more but thus, that *eternall life is called a crowne, because it is giuen in the end of the life, as the crowne is giuen in the end of the race.* Whereto he replyeth, that *if that were all, and that there were noe respect to former deserts, it might then as well bee called a halter.* But *M. Perkins* answer expresseth plainly,

plainly, as we see, that *the crowne* hath reference to them that *continue to the end to walke in good workes*, and therfore left no occasion or place for this hangmanlike and vncituill reply. But his mind, it seemeth, was strongly set vpon the halter, and therfore by head and shoulders he would pull it in, onely to please himselfe and his table companions with a forced and witlesse iest. He addeth further, that *in our opinion it should more properly be called a halter, because all our workes are defiled like a menstruous cloth, and an halter is the end of such wicked workes.* Now we know no reason but that *M. Bishop* by most right, because he hath set downe the sentence, should keepe the halter to himselfe; for that we are wel assured that his best works are defiled as well as ours. But what will he say (I maruell) to Pope *Leo* the third, of whom *Mathew* of Westminister reporteth, that [a] being at Masse, about a good worke no doubt, a woman of his good acquaintance comming with her offering, crushed and kissed his hand, and therewith stirred vp in the Pope (a holy father I warrant you) some motions of the flesh. Now was this no defilement shall we thinke to so good a worke? Surely if *M. Bishop* had liued then, he would haue giuen iudgement of the Pope that hee should be hanged, because a halter is the end of such wicked Masse. But tel vs *M. Bishop*, do all your works goe so cutrantly and clenly frō you, as that you can presume to be free frō the halter, that you haue here made? Haue you neuer offēded at masse in some such like sort as the Pope did? Doth not your mind often wander whē you seem to pray? Doe not sinister thoughts and respects many times interpose themselues, and make you to go crooked when you thinke to go vpright? Take heed that hereafter it be not said vnto you, *Patere legem quam ipse tuleris: Be tried by the law which thou thy selfe hast made*: a halter is the end of such wicked workes. But of the condition of our workes, more hath been said before, then euer *M. Bishop* will bee able to disproue. Here he concludeth, that *as a halter is due to a theefe, so is the crowne of glorie the iust reward of the righteous man.* True say wee, but yet not by the vertue of his righteousnesse and desert, but by the merciſull promise of Almightie God. In respect of which promise, it is called, as *M. Perkins* answereth, *a crowne of iustice*, because God by his promise hath bound himselfe to giue it, and in the performance of his promise he is approued iust. And this is the constant confession of vs all, which *M. Bi-*

[a] *Matth. Westm. lib. 1. Anno. 798. Mulier quedam, ad quam aliquādo accessum habuit, vt dicebatur, manum eius comprimit inter celebrādum & comprimendo deosculāt, vncentiuli libidinis in Papa excitauit.*

*ſhop* ſeemeth to apprehend as caſually or forcedly ſpoken by *M. Perkins*, that *eternall life is due debt to the righteous and faithfull*, yet with that exception ſtill, which he thinketh *M. Perkins* added as *hauing ouerſhot himſelfe*, becauſe his ignorance conceiueth not how theſe two ſtand together, *not for any deſert of theirs, but only for his promiſe ſake*, as hath bin declared ſufficiently[b] before, in defending the anſwer to the third obiection. But as touching the place here handled, he ſhall find *S. Bernard* expounding this *crowne of iuſtice* in the ſame ſort as we do.[c] *It is a crowne of iuſtice* (ſaith he) *which Paul expecteth, but of Gods iuſtice, not his owne. For it is iuſt that God pay what he oweth, & he oweth that which he hath promiſed. And this is the iuſtice of which the Apoſtle preſumeth, euen the promiſe of God.* Albeit it is true alſo, that mans iuſtice is crowned, & that in that reſpect alſo it is *a crowne of righteouſnes*, who maketh queſtion therof? but ſtill it is true, that it is not due to mans righteouſneſſe by merite and deſert, but is tied to it onely by the promiſe and grace of God. And thus doth the Apoſtle reckon his good ſeruice, for which the iuſt Iudge would render *a crowne of iuſtice*, not as pleading his deſert thereof, but knowing that God hath promiſed ſuch reward to ſuch ſeruice. Hee alledgeth to the contrary the examples of them that were called into the vineyard, and of the other that receiued the talents, but of them he hath before receiued anſwer. Al his error is, that he cannot conceiue *worke* and *reward*, but that it muſt neceſſarily imply merite and deſert, which notwithſtanding children can diſtinguiſh, becauſe great reward by fauour may be giuen when the worke is in no ſort to be thought worthy of it. As for the place of *Auſtine* which he produceth, it giueth him no ſuccor. We find there *worke* and *reward: I haue fought a good fight, &c. the worke. There is layd vp for me a crowne of iuſtice*; *the reward:* but we do not finde that the reward is deſerued by the worke: we do not find that by vertue of *merite* the iuſtice of God any way ſtandeth bound vnto him. Nay in the ſame ſermon *S. Auſtin* ſaith,[d] *Pardon me Apoſtle, I know nothing of thine owne but euill: therefore when he crowneth thy merits, he crowneth nothing but his owne gifts.* His collection from the place is already anſwered, that by the promiſe the reward is yeelded to the worke. In the other place there is nothing more then in that I haue ſpoken of, and hath full anſwer by the ſame exception. Onely I will remember *M. Biſhop*, that

b *Sect. 17.*

c *Bernard de grat. & lib. arb. Eſt ergo quam Paulus expectat corona iuſtitiæ, ſed iuſtitiæ Dei, non ſuæ. Iuſtum eſt quippe vt reddat quod debet: debet autem quod pollicitus eſt. Et hæc eſt iuſtitia de qua præſumit Apoſtolus promiſſio Dei:*

d *Auguſt. lib. 50. homil. 14. Da veniam Apoſtole, propria tua non noui niſi mala. Cùm ergo Deus coronat merita tua; nihil coronat niſi dona ſua.*

that by *S. Austins* doctrine there can no merit bee pleaded on our behalfe, because all our good workes come from grace on Gods behalfe, so that therefore the crowne is but *grace for grace*, and a latter mercy added as the consequent of a former mercy. And this *S. Austin* noteth concerning this very place of *S. Paul* here debated. [e] *The Lord will render vnto me a crowne of righteousnes. Why? because I haue fought a good fight, &c. But whence hast thou fought a good fight? &c. Yea not I, but the grace of God with me. Then it is by his mercy that thou art crowned. Be nowhere proud, but alwaies praise the Lord.* In a word he saith againe as before wee haue seene, that [f] *God crowneth our merits, not as our merits, but as his owne gifts*: and if they goe not vnder account of our merits in heauen, why are they so earnestly pleaded for as ours here vpon the earth?

e *Idem in Psal. 102. Reddet mihi Dominus, &c. Quare? Quia bonum certamen certaui, &c. Vnde certasti? &c. Non ego autem sed gratia Dei mecum. Ergo & quod coronaris, illius misericordia coronaris. Nusquam sis superbus: semper laudadominum.*

f *Idem de grat. & lib. arb. cap. 7. Non coronat Deus merita tua tanquam merita tua, sed tanquã dona sua.*

## 21. W. Bishop.

*And that the Reader may vnderstand, that not onely* S. Augustine *doth so confidently teach this doctrine of merits (which* Master Perkins *blushed not to terme the inuention of Satan,) I will fold vp this question with some testimonies of the most ancient and best Authors.*

*S. Ignatius, the Apostles auditor saith*: Giue me leaue to become the food of beasts, that I may by that meanes merit and win God.

*Epist. ad Roman.*

*Iustine a glorious Martyr of the next age hath these words, speaking in the name of all Christians*: We think that men who by works haue shewed themselues worthie of the will and counsell of God, shall by their merits liue and raigne with him, free from all corruption and perturbation.

*Apolog. 2. ant. med.*

*S. Irenæus saith*: Wee esteeme that crowne to be precious which is gotten by combat and suffering for Gods sake.

*Lib. 4 cont. hæres. cap. 72.*

*S. Basil.* All wee that walke the way of the Gospell, as merchants do, buy and get the possession of heauenly things by the workes of the commandements. A man is saued by workes of iustice.

*Ora in initium prou. Lib. de Spir. sancto, cap. 24.*

*S. Cyprian.* If the day of our returne shall find vs vnloden, swift, and running in the race of works, our Lord will not faile to reward our merits. He will giue for workes to those that winne in peace, a white crown, and for martyrdome in persecution he will redouble vnto them a purple crowne.

*Serm. de eleemos. in fine.*

*S. Hilary.* The kingdome of heauen is the hire and reward of them that liue well and perfectly.

*Can. 5. in Math.*

Lib.1.de Offic.c.15. *S. Ambroſe.* It is euident that there remaineth after this life either reward for merits, or puniſhment.

*S. Hierome.* Now after baptiſme it appertaineth to our trauels, according vnto the diuerſity of vertue, to prepare for vs different rewards.

Ser.68.in Cant. *S. Bernard.* Prouide that thou haue merits, for the want of them is a pernicious pouertie.

*Briefly that this was the vniuerſall doctrine of all good Chriſtians aboue a thouſand yeeres paſt, is declared in the Councell of Arauſicane:*

Can.18. Reward is debt vnto good works if they be done, but grace which was not debt, goeth before, that they may be done. *These teſtimonies of the moſt ancient and beſt learned Chriſtians, may ſuffice to batter the brazen forehead of them that affirme the doctrine of merites to be a Satanicall inuention, and to ſettle all them that haue care of their ſaluation, in the moſt pure doctrine of the Catholike Church.*

## R. Abbot.

Here *M. Biſhop* will giue vs to vnderſtand, that not only *S. Auſtin*, but all antiquity teacheth the doctrine of merits, ſo that *M. Perkins* might *bluſh to call it the inuention of Satan.* But *M. Perkins* had no cauſe to bluſh in that reſpect. He knew well that antiquitie is more vanted by Papiſts then followed. He knew well that in this doctrin of *merites* they wickedly bely antiquity and the Fathers. And indeede neuer any Father ſpake of merits, as they haue done. Iuſtly therfore did he call it, as it is, *the inuention of Satan*, ſeruing only to delude men, to put them in vaine hope, to lift them vp in pride, with opinió of gaining heauẽ, that they may by their pride be caſt down to hell. But for the cleering of this point, it is to be vnderſtood, that the name of *merits* is indeed verie vſuall amongſt the Fathers of the Latin Church, but with no ſuch meaning as the Church of Rome hath fancied thereof. For they only intended thereby briefly & in one word to ſignifie good works, workes that pleaſe God, that are accepted in Gods ſight, that find fauor with God, & obtain reward at his hands. They dreamed not that in good works there ſhould be a iuſt deſert of heauen, that they ſhould *deſerue it worthily*, that they ſhold be *fully worthy of euerlaſting life*, that good works ſhold as wel be the cauſe of ſaluation, as euill works are the cauſe of damnation, that

that good works are *so far meritorious, so far* I say *meritorious*, as that God should be vniust if he rendered not heauen for them, as in the beginning hath bin shewed that now is the language of the church of Rome, These speeches or the like was neuer heard of amongst the Fathers. They vsed the word *merite* according to the signification wherein commonly they vsed the verbe *mereri*, which with them imported *to obtaine, to find fauour for any thing to be giuen or done*; so as that wicked men are said sometimes *mereri*, not surely to deserue, but to receiue or to find the fauour of benefits at Gods hands; yea and good men are said *mereri* not to deserue, but to receiue or to find euill vsage at the hands of the wicked. But by examples the matter will be plainer then by words. *S. Austine* saith,

[a] *Huius vitæ solatia quidam etiam cultores dæmonum accipere meruerunt: Some who haue bin worshippers of diuels haue merited*, that is, haue found the fauour *to receiue the comforts of this life*. Againe, [b] *Apostoli à suis ciuibus occidi meruerunt: The Apostles merited*, that is, found such vsage as *to bee killed of their owne people*. [c] *Pro actione gratiarum flammas meruimus odiorum: In stead of thanks wee haue merited*, that is, we found at their hands *the fire of hatred*. [d] *Caueat homo ne ab illo misericordiam mereatur homo contra eius sententiam, à quo factus est homo: Let man take heede that man doe not merite*, that is, *obtaine mercie of him, against the sentence of him, by whom man was made*. So doth *Ambrose* vse the same word, [e] *Iniquus Cain longauam duxit atatem, duxit vxorem, & hoc meruit promissione diuina: Wicked Cain lined long and married a wife, and this he merited*, that is obtained or receiued *by the permission of God*. [f] *Non debemus mirari quòd Ioannes tantam gratiam nascendo meruerit: Wee are not to wonder that Iohn in his birth merited*, that is, obtained *so great grace*. So *Hilary* speaketh, [g] *Libros quæso habere mereamur: I pray you let vs merit*, that is, find the fauour *to haue those bookes*. So *Hierom*, [h] *Veniam mereri debeo: I am to merite*, that is, to obtaine pardon. So *Gregorie* Bishop of Rome, [i] *Paulus cum redemptoris nomen in terra conaretur extinguere, eius verba de cœlo meruit audire: Paul when he went about to extinguish the name of Christ vpon earth, merited*, that is, found the mercy & fauour *to hear his words from heauen*. In another place, *O felix culpa quæ talem ac tantũ meruit habere Redemptorẽ: O happy sin of Adam that merited*, that is, found the mercy *to haue such and so great a redeemer*. *S. Austin* applieth the word also

a *August. de ciu. Dei. lib. 5. cap. 24.*

b *Idem in Psal. 35*

c *Cons. lit. Petil. lib. 3. cap. 6.*

d *De anima & eius orig. lib. 2. cap. 12.*

e *Amb. de Caino & Abel. lib. 2. cap. 10*

f *Idem ser. 53.*

g *Hilar. epist. apud Aug. tom. 7.*

h *Hieron. præfat: in Abdiam.*

i *Gregor. Moral. lib. 9. cap. 17.*

to beasts and cattel,[k] *Homines habent aliquid apud Deum exceptum quod iumenta non merentur; Men haue somewhat excepted with God which beasts merit not*, that is *obtaine not*. Thus the word hath grown also into translations, wherein the originals there hath bin no occasion of it. Where *Cain* saith, *Mine iniquitie is greater then can bee pardoned*, the Vulger Latin translateth,[l] *Maior est iniquitas mea quã vt veniam merear: Mine iniquity is greater thē that I can merit*, that is obtaine *pardon*. Where S. *Paul* saith,[m] *I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly, &c.* S. *Austine* out of some translation readeth,[n] *Miserecordiam merui, I merited mercy*, but importing nothing but the obtaining thereof. In an Epistle of *Ignatius* wee haue it commonly translated,[o] *I am in loue with none of the things that are seene, vt Iesum Christũ merear adipisci, that I may merit to obtaine Christ*, whereas in the Greeke it is ἵνα τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν εὕρω, that is as *Hierom* translateth it,[p] *vt Iesum Christũ inueniam, that I may find Iesus Christ*. Againe, in the next period the Greeke is ἵνα Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ ἀπολάυσω, where the same translater readeth as before, the words being translated by *Hierome*,[q] *tantum vt Christo fruar, onely that I may enioy Christ*. And thus in infinite places haue they made the Greeke Fathers to speake of *merit*, where they neuer meant any such thing. But to make it plainely to appear, that by *merit* they meant not any such worthines or desert as *M. Bishop* speaketh of, let one sentence of *Ambrose* fully suffice.[r] *All the things that we suffer are too little & vnworthy for the paines wherof there should be rendered to vs so great reward of future good things, as shal be reuealed in vs, whē being reformed to the image of God we shall merit* (that is, attaine) *to see his glorie face to face*. Where to take *merit* properly to import *desert and worthines*, should be to make *Ambrose* in one sentēce absurdly crosse & contrary to himself, to say, that we deserue to see God face to face, when he hath first affirmed that euē our sufferings for Christs sake are vnworthy to haue so great glory yeelded vnto them. The same is more plaine by that that before hath beene alledged out of *Gregorie*,[s] *If we be iudged without mercy, our work is worthy to bepunished which we expect to haue rewarded: therefore the teares of expiation* (saith he) *are required, that humilitie of prayer may lift vp the merite of our good worke to the obtaining of eternall reward*. Where wee see he vseth the name of *merit* as vsually they were wont, but sheweth that it is so far from being truly *merit*, as that in extremity it is worthy

k *August. in Psal. 35.*

l Genes. 4. 13.

m 1. Tim. 1. 13.

n *Aug. de Bapt. con. Donat. lib. 4. cap. 5.*

o *Ignat. epist. ad Romanos.*

p *Hieron. in Cat. Eccles. Script.*

q *Ibid.*

r *Amb. epist. 22. Omnia quæ patimur minora sunt & indigna pro quorum laboribus tanta rependatur futurorum merces bonorum quæ reuelabitur in nobis cùm ad Dei imaginem reformati gloriam eius facie ad faciem aspicere meruerimus.*

s Of iustification sect. 49. ex *Gregor. Moral. lib. 9. cap. 18.*

thy to bee punished, and that it needeth *teares of expiation*, that is, earnest intercession & prayer to God for Christs sake to remit the spots and blemishes thereof, and that it is thus by praier onely, that is, by fauour, that any reward is yeelded vnto it. But to this place most properly belongeth that of S. *Bernard* before mentioned, that [t] *the merits of men are not such as that eternal life is due for thē of right or as if God should do wrong, if he did not yeeld the same vnto thē.* [u] *If* (saith he) *wee will properly name those which wee call our merites, they are the way to the kingdom, not the cause of our obtaining the kingdome.* Where most plainely he giueth to vnderstand, that the name of *merits* is vnproperly abused, and howsoeuer custome had taken it vp, to call good works by the name of merits, yet that we are not to conceiue, that good workes for themselues can challenge any thing by any right, or that we can truly and properly be said thereby to deserue at the hands of God. And this is fully confirmed by *Alfonsus de Castro*, who mentioning reward due to works, saith [x] *It is due, not by the nature of the worke, for the sufferings of this time are not comparable in worth to the future glory which shal bee reuealed vpō vs, but it is due by right of promise: for nature hath taught vs this law, that euery man should take himselfe to owe that which he hath promised.* Surely if the debt of the reward arise not frō the nature of the work but onely by vertue of promise, then merit is no merit properly, because merit properly so called, ariseth from the nature of the work, being in it selfe iustly worthy of that that it is said to deserue.

To come thē to the testimonies cited by *M. Bishop*, the first therof which he citeth out of [a] *Ignatius*, is a false translation, there beeing nothing in the Greeke to import merit, but onely *the getting or gaining, or obtaining of God*, as hath bene said. *Suffer me* (saith he) *to be the food of beasts, that by them I may obtaine God.* And how far *Ignatius* was from any such opinion of his owne merit, appeareth towards the end of the same Epistle, where he saith, [b] *I am ashamed to be named one of them (the Pastors of the Church:) for I am not worthy to be the very last or the very outcast of them, but I haue found mercie to be some body if I obtaine God.* He reckoned not of merit or worth, but held it a matter of mercie to him to come to God. How hardly thē was *M. Bishop* bestead, that in the forefront would put *Ignatius* when the words that he citeth are nothing for him, and his words in the same Epistle are altogether against him?

t Bernard. in Annunc. ser. 1. Neq; enim talia sunt hominum merita vt propter ea vita æterna debeatur ex iure, aut Deus iniuriam faceret nisi eam donaret.

u Idem. de grat. et lib. arb. Si proprie appellētur ea quæ nostra dicimus merita, &c. via regni sunt, non causa regnandi.

x Alphons. com. her. li. 7. tit. Grat. Debetur inquam non ex operis natura, quia vt ait Paulus, Non sunt condigna, &c. sed ex iure promissionis. Hanc enim legem nos natura docuit, vt quod quisque promisit debere se credat.

a Ignat. epist. ad Roman. Λοιπὸν μοι ἐπιτρέψατε θεοῦ μιμητὴν εἶναι, ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ θέλητε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, χρῆναι, Sinite me bestiarum escam esse per quas Deū assequi licet.

b Ibid. Ego erubesco ex ipsis dici. Non enim sum dignus esse vltimus aut purgamentum, sed misericordiam consecutus sum vt sim aliquis si Deum adipiscer. Ἐγὼ δὲ αἰσχύνομαι, ἵνα ὑπ' αὐτῶν λεγωμαι· οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰμὶ ἄξιος ὢν ἔσχατος αὐτῶν, καὶ περίψημα· ἀλλὰ ἠλεήμην τις εἶναι ἐὰν θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω,

The words of *Iustinus Martyr* also are very lewdly abused in the same māner. The words *merit is suis, by their merits*, are meerly foisted in, neither is there any thing that can be construed to that purpose. [c] *They* (saith he) *who by their workes shall shew themselues to the counsell of God worthy*, or as *M. Bishop* translateth out of *Bellarmine*, *who by their workes shew themselues worthy of the counsell and will of God, we haue receiued that hee doth vouchsafe them to haue company with him to raigne with him, being made immortall & free from all perturbation.* Where he nameth *worthinesse* in no other sort then the Scripture doth, as hath bin before shewed, comparatiuely, not simply; by acceptation, not by perfection; according to the phrase of men, whereto the holy Ghost is content sometimes to submit himselfe, not according to the exact censure of the iudgement of God: not as a matter of Popish merite, whereto God in iustice is bound, but to which God in fauor *vouchsafeth*, as he saith, *to haue company with him.* And this he maketh very plaine, when in the next words he addeth, [d] *For in like sort as he created vs when we were not, so dowe thinke that he vouchsafeth them of immortality and dwelling with him who willingly make choise to do those things that are pleasing vnto him. Now to haue being at first it was not of our selues. In like sort to chuse and follow what is pleasing to him, by those reasonable powers which he hath giuen vs, it is by his perswading and mouing of vs to the faith.* Wherby he teacheth, that our being in God, & following of those things that are pleasing to him, is no more of our selues then our first creation and being was, but that it is by Gods perswading vs, Gods mouing vs, Gods working in vs, there being nothing therin to be attributed to our selues. Whereby he destroyeth the nature of merit, as I haue shewed [e] before, & to that purpose acknowledgeth *the vouchsafing* fauor and grace of God in receiuing vs to immortality and life with him; for where merit and desert is, there termes of *vouchsafing* can haue no place. Not that which *Bellarmine* translateth of men *shewing themselues worthy of the wil and counsel of God* may wel be vnderstood according to the phrase of the Apostle instructing vs [f] *to walke worthy of the Lord*, [g] *to walke worthy of God who hath called vs vnto his kingdome and glory*, that is to say, as is fit for them to walke who haue receiued so great mercy at the Lords hands, to the very same purpose as elsewhere he saith [h] *Let your conuersation be such as becommeth the Gospell of Christ.* In which sort

*Iohn*

[c] *Iustin. Mart. Apol. 2.* Ὅσων ἀξίως τοῦ ἰδίου βουλεύματος ἑαυτοὺς δι' ἔργων δεῖξωσι, τῆς μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀναστροφῆς καὶ συμβασιλεύσεως ἀφθάρτου καὶ ἀπαθοῦς γινομένους. *Quos si dignos consilio illius se apertis ostenderint, conuersatione cum ipso dignatum iri accepimus vt vnà regnent incorruptibiles, & à perturbatione immunes effecti.*

[d] See the same of Freewill. sect. 14.

[e] Sect. 3.

[f] Col. 1. 10.

[g] 1. Thess. 2. 12.

[h] Phil. 1. 27.

*Iohn Baptist* saith, [i]*Bring forth fruits worthy of repentance*, that is, such as are fitting and beseeming them that professe to haue repented. So then men shew themselues *worthy of the will and counsel of God*, in behauing themselues as is agreeing to them that professe to know the will and counsell of God, without any necessity of merit to be imported thereby. i Mat. 3. 8.

The words of *Irenæus* are these; [k]*The good combatant exhorteth vs to the combat of immortalitie, that we may be crowned, and may thinke the crown pretious, as being attained by fight, and not of it self accruing vnto vs. And by how much the more it commeth by fight, so much the more precious it is: & the more precious it is, so much the more we may loue it. But the things are not in like sort loued which come of their owne accord, as those which are attained with much care.* In all which, what is there to *M. Bishops* purpose? He onely sheweth that God hath appointed, that not with our ease and idlenesse the crown of life shall voluntary come vnto vs, but that wee with labour and trauell must striue to come to it, that in the attainement of it, it may bee the more joyfull and precious vnto vs. What is this other then we also teach, who yet cannot find heereby that our labour and trauell doth merit and deserue the crowne of life? The case is al one, as if a Prince hauing a subiect false frō him, & gone into a far country, should of meer grace & fauor send for him to come again, by letters patents granting him his pardō, and assuring him place of honor & state vpō his return home: who being to passe through the midst of the enemies of his Prince, must vse much fighting, and trauel, and pains, and vndergo many dangers both by sea and land for the atchieuing of this honor. Whē he comethto his iourneys end he hath no title to pleade for his place, but onely the free donation and gift of his prince. By his labor & paines he hath gained himself the possession of it, & he might for the mean time lay it before him as a reward to comfort & encourage himself in the iourney that he was to make; but merit he can alledge none; no right can he alledge wherby to claime it, but only his Princes gift. Euen so it is with vs, We were false from God, and he hath called vs to him again, and giuen vs the promise of eternall life. By much combat and trauell we must attaine to it, and yet when we haue done all, we can plead no merit, we can make no claime but onely by our Princes gift, by the free and mercifull promise and bounty of Almighty God.

k Iren. lib. 4. cap. 27. Bonus agonista ad incorruptelæ agonem adhortatur nos vt coronemur, & pretiosam arbitremur coronam, videlicet quæ per agonem acquiritur sed nō vltro coalitam. Et quantò per agonē nobis aduenit, tantò est pretiosior. Quanto autem pretiosior tanto eā semper diligamus. Sed neque similiter diliguntur eæ quæ vltro adueniunt quàm illæ, quæ cum multa sollicitudine adinueniuntur.

And

And hereby appeareth the answer to the place of *Basil*, that [l] *we all who walk the way of the Gospell are merchants, getting by the works of the cõmandemẽts the possession of heauenly things* For by the works of the comandements we obtain the possession, but not the right and title of heauenly-things. They are the way wherein wee walke to ataine to that which God of his free mercy bestoweth vpon vs. Wherein because we yeeld our labor in the one to receiue the other, *S. Basil* so farre fitly compareth it to a kinde of merchandize or exchange, though not intending that in the merit of the one should be the purchase of the other. As for the other place, it is none of *Basils* being taken out of a counterfeit addition, which [m] *Erasmus* well obserued, and by good arguments declared to be no part of *Basils* work. [n] *A man* (saith he) *is saued by righteousnesse of works*. But the Scripture saith, [o] *Ye are saued by grace through faith, not of works, least any man should boast*. Whatsoeuer the author might meane in that he saith, we are sure that his words accord not with the phrase and stile of the holy ghost. And that the true *Basil* was farre from that mind, appeareth plainly by the note that he giueth vpon the words of the Psalme, [p] *Arise, O Lord, helpe vs and deliuer vs for thy mercies sake*. [q] *Behold* (saith he) *how he endeth his speech. After a thousand vertues, whereby doth he pray to be saued? Euen of mercie and goodnesse*. And vpon another of the Psalmes he saith, [r] *Rewards, as they are thought to be, are yeelded vnto vs by the onely mercy & goodnes of God: for all the righteousnesses of men cãnot equall the benefits which he hath already bestowed, much lesse those that are to come, which go beyond all the conceit of man*. He saw well, that the Prophet after thousands of vertues could haue no hold of saluation but onely by Gods mercy. He saw well, that albeit Gods benefits goe vnder the name of rewards, yet in all our righteousnesse there is nothing to counteruaile in any sort the bounty of his goodnesse, and therefore was farre from that Pharisaicall and proud opinion of merit, which *M. Bishop* desireth to fasten vpon him. Which is easie to bee seeene in that also which I cited out of him before, that [s] *eternall rest is layd vp for them who lawfully fight the combat of this life, not to be rendred by way of debt to workes, but provided by the grace of the bountiful God for them that trust in him*.

[u] *Cyprian* hath nothing for *M. Bishops* turne, but only the name

l Basil orat in princip. Prouerb. *Omnes nos qui viam Euangelicam incedimus mercatores sumus per operã mandatorum nobis possessionem cœlestium comparantes.*

m *Eras. Ep. 81. præfixa libro Basil. de Spir sancto.*

n *Basil. de Spir. sanct. cap. 24. Homo saluus fit per iustitiam operum.*

o Ephes. 2. 8.

p Psal. 44. 26.

q *Basil. in Psal. 43 Vide quomodo sermonem clauserit. Post mille virtutes vnde seruari orat? Ex misericordia & benignitate.*

r *Idem in Psal. 23 Retributiones quæ putantur propter, sclam Dei benignitatẽ hominibus præstantur. Vniuersa siquidẽ mortalium iustitiæ ne præstita quidem ab ipso bona adequant medum futura quæ & humanam cogitationem transcendunt.*

s *Basil. in Psal. 114. supra sect. 13*

u *Cypr. de eleem. Si expeditos si celeres, si in hoc operis agone currentes dies nos vel redditionis, vel persecutionis inuenerit, nusquam Dominus meritis nostris ad præmium deerit. In pace coronam vincenti ibi candidam pro operibus dabit; in persecutione pro pura & pro passione geminabit.*

of

of *merits*; and it is already shewed that that can auaile him nothing. Instead of *merits* put in *good workes*, which is all that it importeth; and *Cyprian* saith nothing but what we say. No more doth *Hilary*, whose words are, [x] *This is the reward of them that liue well and perfectly, that from this matter of a corruptible bodie they are translated to a new and heauenly substance.* *M. Bishop* somewhat forceth the place to serue his turne, but it is plaine by that that hath beene said before that the names of *hire and reward* are farre enough off from proouing merit and desert, And whatsoeuer they import with men, yet that they import not so with God, let *Hilary* himself be witnes who speaking of the wages of them that were hired into the vineyard, saith, [y] *Wages in deed there is none of gift, because it is due by worke, but God hath giuen the same freely to all by the institification of faith.* There is no merit then in the *reward* that *Hilary* speaketh of, because though it be termed reward, yet it is freely giuen by the iustification of faith.

In the place of *Ambrose* it is plaine, that the name of *merits* is taken indifferently for workes either good or euill. He saith, that [z] *it is euident that for merits there remaineth after this life either reward or punishment*: and *M. Bishop* will not say, that punishment remaineth for the *merits* that he pleadeth for. Yet he calleth *good workes* by the name of *merits*, but to how little purpose for Popish *merit* hath bin already shewed. And how farre *Ambrose* was from opinion thereof his owne words shall witnesse, where hee saith, [a] *Which of vs can stand without the mercie of God? What can we do worthy of the reward of heauen? By what merit of man is it yeelded, that this corruptible should put on in corruption, or this mortall shold put on immortality? By what labours, by what suffering of wrongs can we abate our sinnes? The sufferings of this time are vnworthy for the glory that is to come. Therefore the forme of heauenly decrees goeth before men, not according to our merits, but according to Gods mercie.* This being so by the iudgement of *Ambrose*, why doth *M. Bishop* seeke to perswade vs by the name of *Ambrose*, that God frameth his heauenlie decrees concerning vs according to our merits, and that the works that we do, are worthy of the reward of heauen? Hee vseth commonly the name of *merit* as the rest doe, but neuer had in his heart that matter of *merit* that *M. Bishop* dreameth of.

x Hilar. in Mat. can. 5. Hac recta perfectáque viuendi merces est ut in nouam cælestemque substantiã ex hac corruptibilu corporu materie transeamus.

y Idem. ibid. can. 20. Merces quidẽ ex dono nulla est quia debetur ex opere, sed gratuitã Deus omnibus ex fidei iustificatione donauit.

z Ambros. Offic. lib 1. cap. 25. Nonne euidens est meritorum, aut præmia aut supplicia post mortem manere?

a Ambr. in Psal. 118. ser. 20. Quis nostrum sine diuina potest miseratione subsistere? Quid possumus dignum præmijs facere cælestibus? &c. Quo tandem hominum merito defertur vt hoc corruptibile caro induat incorruptionẽ, & mortale hoc induat immortalitatem? Quibus laboribus quibusue meritis possumus nostra leuare peccata? Indignæ sunt passiones huius temporis ad superuenturam gloriam.

Non ergo secundum merita nostra, sed secundum misericordiam Dei cælestium decretorum homines forma præscribit.

Hierome

*Hierome* also is cited but for shew, and onely to fill vp a place. b *It belongeth to our labour acrording to diuersitie of vertues to prepare for our selues diuersity of rewards.* The rewards by the promises of God are tied to the workes, and therefore in doing the works to which the rewards belong, we may well be said to prepare for our selues the same rewards. As we are said *to worke out our saluation*, because though it be Gods meere grace by which we are saued, yet he vseth our will and our worke for the effecting thereof, so are wee said also *to prepare rewards* for our selues, because God vseth vs as instruments to doe for our selues the works that belong to those rewards which he hath prepared for vs. And these rewards we doubt not, as before was said, but that they are diuers, according to the diuersity of our works, greater rewards to greater works, & lesse reward to lesser works; but what is all this to proue that the rewards are iustly merited and deserued by our workes? That *Hierome* thought not so, it is plaine by that we haue seene out of him c before, that *there can no worke be found worthy of the iustices of God*, as also for that he saith in the name of the people of God, d *If we consider our owne merits, we must despaire*, and resolueth euen concerning e *the iust, that they are not saued by their owne merite, but by the mercie of God.* There followeth Saint *Bernard*, whom *M. Bishop* would not haue cited if he had meant so faithfully as he shold haue done. In what sort *S. Bernard* taketh the name of *merits*, hath bene declared a little before, so as they may well blush to cite any thing out of him for maintaining their doctrine of *merits*. But *M. Bishops* dealing is so much the more vnhonest, for that in the very same sermon *Bernard* ouerthroweth that that he would proue by him. f *To what end is the Church carefull as touching merits, which hath a more sure and secure ground of reioycing by reason of the purpose of God? It is not for thee to aske, by what merits we hope for good things, seeing thou hearest by the Prophet, Not for your sakes, but for mine owne sake will I do it, saith the Lord. It sufficeth for merit, to know that merits are not sufficient. Bee carefull to haue merits; when thou hast them, know them to be giuen thee: but for fruite thereof hope for the mercie of God. The want of merits is a pernitious pouertie.* Thus vnder the name of *merites* he commendeth the hauing of good workes, and our care to be rich therein, shewing that it is a pernicious want to be destitute thereof, and to be men fruitlesse in the Church of God.

But

b *Hieron. aduer. Iouinian. lib. 2* *Nostra laboris est pro diuersitate virtutum, diuersa nobis præmia præparare.*

c *Supra sect. 27.*
d *Hieron. in Esa. lib. 17. cap. 64.* *Si consideremus merita desperandum est.*
e *Idē adu. Pelag. lib. 2. Pro nihilo saluos faciet eos: haud dubiū quin iustos qui non propter merita, sed Dei saluantur clementia.*
f *Bernar. in Cant. ser. 68.* *Quid de meritis sollicita sit Ecclesia cui de proposito Dei firmior suppetit, securiorq; gloriandi ratio? &c. Non est quod iam quærat quibus meritis speremus bona præsertim cùm audias apud prophetam, Non propter vos, &c. Ezec. 36* *Sufficit ad meritum scire quòd non sufficiunt merita, &c. Merita habere curæ; habita data meminerit fructum sperauerit misericordiam Dei, &c. Pernitiosa paupertas meritorum penuria est.*

But yet when we haue them, he teacheth vs to conceiue the vnsufficiency thereof, and to rest the expectation of the fruit and reward thereof onely vpon Gods mercie, who hath promised to performe it, not for our sakes, but for his owne sake, and so fully bereaueth them of that nature of merite which *M. Bishop* doth assigne vnto them. Thus doth he euerie where giue vs to vnderstand his mind: [g] *My merit* (saith he) *is the mercie of the Lord.* [h] *euen the Saints haue neede to intreat for their sinnes, that by thy mercy they may be saued, not trusting to their owne righteousnesse.* And againe: [i] *Dangerous is the dwelling of them that trust in their owne merit: it is dangerous because it is ruinous.* [k] *This is the whole merite of man, to put his whole trust in him who hath wholly saued man.* Many other such like speeches of his might bee alledged, whereby *M. Bishop* may well take occasion to bethinke himselfe, whether hee haue not done *S. Bernard* wrong to make him a patron of the doctrine of merits, which the Church of Rome now maintaineth. Let him dulie consider whether he haue done well to take a little aduantage of a scrap of a sermon, and to vrge it contrarie to the whole drift of the Authour in that place, and his perpetuall doctrine other where.

For conclusion, we are assaulted with a whole generall Councell that saith neuer a word against vs. The Arausican Councell saith, [l] *Reward is due for good works if they be done, but grace which is no due, goeth before, that they may be done.* Euen so say we: we also confesse that there is a reward due vnto good workes, which God taketh vpon him to owe vnto vs; but wee say it with that limitation that before we haue heard out of *S. Austine*, from whom that Councell boroweth almost all that they haue set downe, that [m] *God hath made himselfe a debtor vnto vs, not for any thing that he hath receiued of vs, but by promising all things vnto vs.* It is due then to the worke, not simply in respect of the worke it selfe, or for the merite and worth thereof, but by vertue of the promise that God hath made to them that so worke. And thus we are come to an end of *M. Bishops* antiquity, which we may see doth pitifully faile him, in that out of all antiquity he could bring no stronger proofes then hee hath done; his doctrine of merits being expresly thwarted by the most of them whom he hath brought for defence of it.

But as touching Antiquitie, gentle Reader, for thy further satisfaction, and the better arming of thee (if neede require) against the fraud

g *Ibid. ser. 81. Meritum meum misericordia domini.*

h *Ibid. ser. 73. Opus habent & sancti pro peccatis exorare, vt de misericordia salui fiant: propriæ iustitiæ non fidentes.*

i *In Psal. Qui habitat. ser. 1. Periculosa habitatio illorum qui in meritis suis sperant: periculosa quia ruinosa.*

k *Ibid. ser. 16. Hoc totum hominis meritum si totam spem suam ponat in illo, qui totum hominem salvum fecit.*

l *Concil. Arausic. cap. 18. Debetur merces de bonis operibus si fiant: sed gratia quæ non debetur præcedit vt fiant.*

m *Supra. sect. 17.*

fraud of theſe vndermining Sophiſters, it ſhould not be amiſſe to aduertiſe thee thus much, that as we do, ſo did the ancient Fathers vpon diuers occaſions ſpeake diuerſly of good workes, and both their ſpeeches and ours are always to be weighed according to the ſame occaſions. When there is cauſe to ſet forth the true and proper cauſe of our ſaluation, they referre the ſame as we do to the free grace and mercy of God, and wholly to his gift; they vilifie as we do the workes and worth of men, and acknowledge that there is nothing in vs in the confidence whereof we may offer our ſelues to God; nothing in ſtrength, whereof we can ſtand before God, or whereby we ſhould merit and deſerue any thing at Gods hands. Here workes are conſidered meerly as they are, and as God in ſtrict and preciſe iudgement findeth them to be, and therefore are pronounced of accordingly. But when occaſion requireth to ſpeake only of good works and of the end thereof, and we look no further but to enforce a conſcience of the way wherein God hath called vs to walke to that ſaluation that he hath promiſed, or when we haue in hand to commend any ſpeciall point of godly and vertuous conuerſation, we preſſe the ſame with all iuſtice, as the Fathers do; we ſhew how neceſſarily God requireth the workes of our obedience, how gratiouſly he vouchſafeth in mercie to accept them, how he hath promiſed of his bountie to reward them. We forbeare not to ſay, that eternall life is the ſtipend of our warfare, the hire and wages of our workes; that God hath not appointed heauen for idle perſons and loiterers, but for ſuch as labour for it; that becauſe God *rendereth* heauen, we muſt haue that whereto it is to be rendered: if we haue not, there is no heauen for vs. We ſay, it is a crowne or garland; win it and weare it: it is a haruеſt; labor for it if thou wilt enioy it: it is a field of treaſure; if thou wilt poſſeſſe it, thou muſt purchaſe it. Such kind of ſpeeches euery mã may obſerue, who is either a hearer of our ſermons, or a reader of our bookes. Now if any man will hereof conclude, that we teach the merit of workes, it is his ignorance and miſtaking, and he doth vs wrong. We teach what followeth of what; we teach the dependance and conſequence of good life and eternal life, of the worke and the reward, God hauing ſo ordained the one to be the way whereby he will bring vs to the other. But when we looke to the true cauſe of all, we truly teach that it is God that giueth vs both good life and eternall life, both

the

the worke and the reward, not the one properly for the other, but the one to follow the other, onely for his mercies sake. Thus the fathers also conceiued hereof, as appeareth by that that hath bene alledged from them. We speake as they spake, and they as we; and the Papists do them absurd wrong to wrest & straine their speeches as they do. Whatsoeuer *M. Bishop* hath cited from them, vnderstand it according to *S. Bernards* rule before set down, *as of the way not as of a cause*, & they differ nothing at all from that that we say.

## Chapter 6.

# OF SATISFACTION.

### 1. W. Bishop.

MAster *Perkins* acknowledgeth first ciuil satisfactiō, that is, a recompence for iniuries or damages any way done to our neighbour: such as the good Publican *Zacheus* practised, who restored fourefold the things gotten by extortion and deceit. *This is wittily acknowledged by him, but little exercised among Protestants; for where the Sacrament of Confession is wanting, there men vse very seldome to recompēce so much as one fold for their extortion, bribes, vsury, and other craftie ouerreaching of their neighbours. But of this kind of satisfaction, which we commonly call restitution, we are not here to intreat, nor of that publike penance, which for notorious crimes is done openly, but of such priuat penance which is either enioyned by the confessor, or voluntarily vndertaken by the penitent, or else sent by Gods visitation to purge vs from that temporall paine, which for sins past and pardoned we are to endure, either in this life, or in purgatorie if we die before we haue fully satisfied here.* Pag. 117. Luk. 19.

### R. Abbot.

We wil neuer beleeue you *M. Bishop*, that your vpstart sacrament of Confession hath any such effect as you pretend for satisfaction and restitution of euill gotten goods, vntill we shall certainly vnderstand, that your masters the Iesuites haue made restitution of those

those goods which you and your fellow Seculars, by *Watson* your proctor, haue charged them to haue embezelled by cosinage and villanie, in drawing them by their notable imposture of *spirituall exercise* to sell their whole estate, and to put the money into their hands. I might write heere a pretie storie, to shew what fruites your sacrament of confession hath yeelded in that behalfe; but the occasion no further requiring then it doth, let that one example now suffice. But in *M. Perkins* wordes you might haue taken knowledge of a Protestant, namely *Zacheus*, without any sacrament of confession, offering restitution to them to whom he had done wrong; and doubt not you, but the rest who faithfully are that which they professe to bee, are alwaies readie to doe the like, and that more holily and religiously then you are wont to do. But to the purpose, the *satisfaction* here spoken of, is *the yeelding of a sufficient and worthy recompence and contentment to God for the trespasse that we haue done vnto him.* The verie naming whereof may be sufficient to make vs detest the doctrine of these wretched men, who doubt not, to the singular impeachment and dishonor of the crosse of Christ, to attribute vnto men a power for the performance of any such satisfaction vnto God. We may well maruell, that any taking vpon him to be a Christian man should haue his heart so senslesse and dead, as not to abhorre to think that a man should be said to giue a worthy recompence to God for his owne sinne. By which meanes they make that a matter of our merite, which neuer any faithfull man imagined to bee any other but Gods meere mercie; and teach men to seeke for that in themselues, which they should find only in the bloud of Christ; and take away the true conscience of thankfulnesse to God for the remission of our sinnes, whilest we can plead that hee doth not so forgiue vs, but that wee are faine to make him amends, & giue him full satisfaction for the wrong. Nay it taketh away also the true conscience of sinne it selfe, whilest it is hereby conceiued to bee a matter of so small moment, as that our beggerly deuotions and obseruations should bee thought to bee an effectuall expiation and redemption thereof. Yea and it argueth a verie base conceit of the high maiestie of God, to thinke so base trumperie, such baggage deuices as they haue forged, to bee a fitte and sufficient recompence for an offence to him. But heerein the Church of Rome hath renewed another point of the Pelagian he-

resie,

nise, who teacheth that pardon and forgiuenes is not giuen to penitents according to the grace and mercy of God, but according to the merits and labour or paines of them who by repentance shall be worthy of Gods mercy. Thus the Pelagians affirmed, and thus the Papists affirm: the others euil deserts still accord in one. Against the Pelagians the ancient Church defined as we do now against the Papists, that it is to be confessed, that pardō is graunted to the penitent or repentant by the grace and mercy of God, not according to their merits, in asmuch as the Apostle telleth vs, that repentāce is of the gift of God. Here is no interposing of merit or satisfactiō, here is nothing but grace and mercy, which is of grace in any sort, as we haue heard before out of S. Austin, except it be free in euery sort. Arnobius derideth in the Pagans this opinion of their satisfactions to their gods, and out of the nature and disposition of the true God, telleth them what the behauiour of their gods should be, if they were indeed as they are called Gods. *De lingadai* (he saith) *her selfe in her own nature great lasse children, to appease them and to make them leaue crying, doth bid a bird and puppies, and babbibors fus and cakes, to withdraw them from the things they mourn for: so the immortall Gods receiue these pacifications whereby to put away their anger, reconcile and be reconciled to the that offended them. Can I haue thought that the Gods without any accompence or satisfaction would leaue their anger, and cease to punish their offence? For it is, saith he, the property of Gods liberally to forgiue, to graunt free pardons.* This censure of Arnobius the Papists also vndergo, who make God in the like sort as did the Pagans, to sell his own mercy for our satisfactions, and deny that God giueth to the penitent any sinne pardon, but he willeth a recompence for the offence done vnto him, yea and that after the sinne is not only put away, but also pardoned, as we are here told. Which I wish the gentle reader to obserue diligently, that thou maist see heerein how the soule is handled and managed by the Papists. Their satisfactions, as they call them, or rather iniunctions by the Confessor, are taken by the penitent as sent by Gods institution. The priest enioyneth some small thing, either some money giuing a fee to a Priest, or a gift to holy Church, or after the Friers day dinner to fast at night with Sutes, take a sickbeare, & wine, & to mumble a few Paternosters, Auemaries, and Creedes (such & such dales for one sinne, and such dales for another, and so forth) and then receiue the Bishops blessing, or to haue holy water, or to say one Paternoster, or to giue himselfe a knocke

a *Aug. Epist. 106. Quod pœnitentibus vera non datur secundū gratiam & misericordiam Dei, sed secundum merita & laborem eorum qui per pœnitentiam digni fuerint misericordia.*

b *Ibid. Fatetur secundum gratiā & misericordiam Dei veniā pœnitentibus dari, non secundum merita eorum, quandoquidem etiam ipsa pœnitentiam donū Dei dixit Apostolus, &c.*

c *Aug. cont. Pelag. & Celest. lib. 2. cap. 24.*

d *Arnob. Aduersus gentes lib. 7. Ergone iniurias suas Dij vendunt atq; vt paruuli passiones quas animis parcunt abstinent aut quas plorātibus passerculos, pupulos, equuleos panes acetiput, quibus auocari se possint, ita a Dijs immortalis placamenta ista sumunt, quibus iras atque animos ponant, & in gratiam suis cum offensoribus redeant? Atque ego nihil Deorum &c.*

e *Sext proem. in Glossa venialia remittuntur per benedictionem Prælati, per orationem dominicam, aquam benedictam, tunsionem pectoris, &c.*

on the breſt, or ſome ſuch like matter will be ſatisfaction good enough. Such impudent and ſhameles harlots, haue we to do with, who ſtick not with their ridiculous toyes to abuſe and vilifie the maieſty of God, & to make a mockery of the appeſing of that wrath before which the Angels themſelues haue no ſtrength to ſtand. The like impiety we ſee in the other kind of ſatisfaction, which he ſaith are ſent by *Gods viſitation*, whereby we muſt think that euery ague, euery bile, euery ſore finger is a ſatisfaction for our ſins. For although God do lay theſe things vpon vs, yet we in the bearing thereof do yeeld him a recompence for ſuch treſpas or offence as we haue done to him. Now if we performe not theſe ſatisfactions here, then wee muſt after this life make ſatisfaction in the fire of Purgatory, if wee take not good order for the quenching of it. As for hel fire it makes no great matter; that burnes but little at Rome: the only Catholike fire is Purgatory fire. Hell yeeldeth neither gold nor ſiluer, but Purgatory is a rich mine, and the fire thereof melteth much treaſure out of mens purſes, that it may run into the Popes mint: & therfore no maruell if there be much Catholike buſineſſe, & many bellowes blowing to keepe it from going out. This is a terrible fire, I warrant you, & if it be not enough to melt gold and ſiluer, how cruelly doth it ſcorch the tender ſoules, that lye frying and broyling in it? Hard therefore will be the caſe of them that neglect to make full ſatisfaction while they liue here: but yet there is a helpe for that, for the Popes pardon will cut off all. The Pope hath a ſtore-houſe of ſatisfactions at Rome, wherin he hath hoorded vp whatſoeuer the Virgin *Mary*, & the Apoſtles, & other Saints & Martyrs haue by way of ſatisfaction payed to God more then they ought him, & if a man will come off and be liberal, he can thence furniſh him with ſufficient to make vp that which he wanteth of his owne for payment for all his ſins. And heere good holy Father perceiuing in theſe times ſo great decay of deuotion, & a lothſomnes but euen contempt almoſt of penance, (except it be ſuch as is greater then the nature of pure compaſſion can beare, as to forſake Chriſt and his Church and his ſacraments, and periſh miſerably) that men will not only not enioyned penance, but alſo not giue ſo much as the poore ſimple ſoules that are departed either in this world or in the next, I meane God is waxen more remiſſe in theſe latter times, and is not ſo ſtrict to require ſatisfaction as he was wont to be, and hath bin con-

‖ Rhem. Teſtam. Anot. in 2 Cor 2.11.

content to put the penalties and forfeitures that are made to him into the Popes hands, that he may make benefit of them, as hauing greater occasion of expences then *Peter* & *Paul* & the first Bishops of Rome had. But one thing there is that maketh vs here somewhat to stick: *M. Bishop* reckoneth Gods visitations for one part of these satisfactions. Now the Pope hauing so large power to remit *all temporall punishments due or deserued, either in this world or the next*, we wonder that we could neuer yet heare, that a Popes pardon hath eased a fit of an ague, or cured head-ach, or tooth-ach, or such like: whereas by their assertion it should be strong enough to break the stone in the bladder, to cure the Stranguric, the Gowt, the Gangrene, the *Nali me tangere*, & whatsoeuer else Phisitians & Chirurgians do account incurable. How should wee thinke that he that cannot giue helpe for any of these should bee of power to set men free from Purgatory paines? But by his failing so wholy in these, we take him to be a lier in all the rest, & do proue both him and his Factors to be the notable impostors and coosoners of the world, *strongly couertoused with fained words making merchandize of mens soules, and speaking things which they ought not for filthy lucres sake.* We must take you (*M. Bishop*) to be one of these vnlesse you bring vs better matter then we looke for, for the proofe of these things. Of Purgatory vntil you giue vs further occasion to speak further of it, sufficient hath bene already said in answere of your Epistle to the King.

s 2. Pet. 3. 3. Apoc. 18. 13. h Tit. 1. 11.

i Act. 10. 16. 26

## 2. W. BISHOP.

M. Perkins *in his third conclusion decreeth very solemnly*, That no man can be saued, vnlesse he made a perfect satisfaction vnto the iustice of God for al his sins. *Yet in the explication of the difference betweene vs, defineth as peremptorily, that no man is so satisfie for any one of al his sinnes, or for any temporal paine due to the: which be flat contradictory propositions, and therfore the one of them must needs be false. But such odde brakes rubbish doth he commonly cast into the ground-worke of his questions, and thereupon raiseth the tottering building of his new doctrine: and lets not, like a blind man, to make an entrey, that misse matter the Papists erre in the very foundation and life of religion: which in his first argument he goes about to proue thus:*

Imperfect satisfactio is no satisfaction at al, but the Papists make Christs satisfaction imperfect, in that they do thereunto adde a (up-

ply of humane satisfaction: & so, they make it no satisfaction at all.

Antiv. But it a most pitifull argument to raise the cry upon: which hath both propositions false. The first is evident: for he that satisfieth for halfe his debts, or for any part of the, makes some satisfaction, which satisfaction is vnperfect, & yet cannot be called no satisfaction at all, as every child may see. His second is as vntrue: saying satisfaction is not to supply the want of Christs satisfaction, but to apply it to vs; as M. Perkins saith his faith doth to them, and to fulfill his will and ordinance.

God doth in baptisme for Christs sake pardon both all sinn, and take wholly away all paine due to sinne, so that he who dieth in that state, goeth presently to heaven. But if we do afterward vngratefully forsake God, & contrary to our promisse transgresse against his commandements, then (as the order of his diuine iustice requires) that we be not so easily reconciled & taken into his fauor: but he vpon our repentance, pardoning the sin and the eternall punishment due vnto it through Christ, doth exact of euery man a temporall satisfaction, answerable vnto the fault committed: not to supply Christs satisfaction, which was of infinite value, and might more easily haue taken away this temporall punishment, then it doth the eternall: but lest by the smart and grieuousnes of this punishment, the man may be scared from sinning, and be made more carefull to auoid sinn: and also by this meanes be made members conformable to Christ our head, that suffering with him, we may raigne with him. And therefore he taking satisfaction for the eternall punishment, which we are not able to do, doth lay the temporall paine vpon our shoulders, that according vnto the Apostle, Euery man do beare his owne burden. Gal. 6.

R. Abbot.

M. Bishop well knew that M. Perkins speech importeth no contradiction, because in the one he intendeth that euery man is to make satisfaction for his sinnes, either by himself or by a Mediator; and in the other denieth that any man maketh this satisfaction, or any part therof by him self. Though the phrase were not so ease of our making satisfaction, when wee meant it by another; yet this meaning was very plaine. There must be a satisfaction yeelded to the iustice of God, which is done onely in Iesus Christ, a whom God himselfe hath set foorth to be an atonement or reconciliation through faith in his bloud. Here is therefore no broken rubbish, but a sure foundation laid, and the building reared vpon it standeth firme a Rom. 3. 25.

and

and fast, the wind wherewith *M. Bishop* hath blown against it being only his owne breath. And because b *there is no other foundation to be laid*, but only that which he hath laid, *which is Iesus Christ*, therefore not like a blind man, but vpon good discernment and sight, he hath made the outcry, that the Papists laying another foundatiō in the merits and satisfaction of men, do erre in the very foundation and life of Christian faith. To shew this he argueth in this sort: *A satisfaction that is made imperfect either directly or by consequent, is no satisfaction at all. But the Papists make Christs satisfaction imperfect, in that they adde a supply of humane satisfactions: therefore they make Christs satisfactiō no satisfaction at all. A substantial argumēt*, saith *M. Bishop* well, if it be not so, we expect that *M. Bishop* make it appeare to vs by a very substantiall answer. He telleth vs, that *both the propositions are false, yea the first* (saith he) *is Childish*, but well we wot that he hath giuen vs a very childish reason why he so saith. *He that satisfieth for halfe his debts or any part therof*, saith he, *makes some satisfaction*. But we tel him, that therin he fondly misapplyeth the name of *satisfaction*, which is a word of perfection, and therfore cānot be rightly vsed of that that is imperfect. It importeth the doing of that that is sufficient and enough to giue ful contentment to the party to whom it is done, and fully to quit the offence and wrong that is done vnto him. Therefore no man but *M. Bishop* is so mad as to say, that by the tender of a penny, a man offereth a satisfaction, when the debt or damage is an hundred pounds. Yea and howsoeuer the name of satisfaction may be abused in party-payment for matters of meere debt, yet he should remember, that in their schooles it is resolued, that because *Satisfaction*, as here it is spoken of, is c *the taking away of displeasure and offence, and the taking away of offence is the restitution of friendship and loue, and there cānot be restitution of friendship and loue, so long as any impediment therof cō-tinueth, therfore there can be no satisfactiō for one sin.* (that is, for one part of a mās debt) *so long as there is a remainder of another. M. Bishop* might very well conceiue, that God receiueth not recompence of his wrongs by pence and halfpence, nor doth account the sacrifice of a sheep to be some *satisfaction* towards the sauing of a soule. But it is the 2. proposition that specially concernes the point. To that he answereth, that *mans satisfaction is not to supply the want of Christs satisfaction*. Where we see it to be with them, as *Tertullian*

b 1. Cor. 3. 11.

c *Thom. Aquin. Supplement. q. 14. art. 1. c. Cum per satisfactionē tollī debeat offensa precedentis peccati, offensæ autem ablatio sit amicitiæ diuinæ restitutio, quæ per quodlibet peccatū impeditur, fieri non potest, vt homo de vno peccato satisfaciat alio retento. Vide in corp. art.*

d Tertullian. aduerſ. Valent. Nihil magis curant quàm occultare quod prædicant, ſi tamen prædicant qui occultant, &c. Negant quicquid agnoſcunt.

mentioneth of the Valentinian heretickes, d *They care for nothing more then to hide that which they preach, if at leaſt they preach who conceale and hide, they deny it howſoeuer they well know it.* They do indeed make the ſatisfaction of Chriſt vnperfect, & our ſatisfactions to be the ſupply of his want, but yet becauſe that ſoundeth odiouſly, they will not haue it knowne or taken that they do ſo. Yet *M. Perkins* brought proofe thereof out of one their great Schoolemen, *Gabriel Biel*, who plainely ſaith, that *although the paſſion of Chriſt be the principall merit for which is conferred grace, and the opening of the kingdome and glory, yet it is neuer the alone and totall meritorious cauſe. It is manifeſt* (ſaith he) *becauſe alwaies with the merit of Chriſt there concurreth ſome worke, as the merit of congruitie or condignitie of him that receiueth grace or glorie, if he be of yeares, and haue the vſe of reaſon, or of ſome other for him if he want reaſon.* Here it is expreſly affirmed, that the paſſion of Chriſt is not *a totall meritorious cauſe*, and if it be not a totall cauſe, then it wanteth a ſupply, & that that is added for the producing of the effect, muſt neceſſarily beholden to be added for a ſupply of that that it wanteth. Seeing then to the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, as not being a total and perfect cauſe, our ſatisfactions are added for the producing of the effects of grace & glorie, it cannot be denied but that our ſatisfactiõs are a ſupply of ſomwhat wanting to the ſatisfaction of Chriſt. To this acknowledgment taken out of their owne bookes, why doth *M. Biſhop* anſwer nothing, but that in his conſcience he knoweth that they are guilty of that wherwith they are charged? Yea and the thing is very apparent of it ſelfe: for if they held the ſatisfaction of Chriſt to be a totall and perfect ſatisfactiõ, then they muſt needs confeſſe that in the nature of a ſatisfaction nothing elſe ſhould be needfull for vs. But they require ſomwhat elſe as needfull in the nature of a ſatisfaction. Therfore they do not confeſſe the ſatisfaction of Chriſt to be a totall and perfect ſatisfaction: for it implieth a manifeſt contradiction, to affirme any thing to be a total cauſe, and yet to require another cauſe as neceſſary for the ſame effect. *M. Biſhop* telleth vs, that the vſe of our ſatisfactiõs is *to apply vnto vs Chriſts ſatisfaction, and to fulfil his will and ordinance.* A goodly and witty deuice. I haue a medicin fully ſufficient and availeable for the curing & healing of my wound, & I muſt haue another medicin for the healing of the ſame wound, which I muſt apply and lay to the former medicine. My ſurety hath fully

fully and perfectly discharged my debt, and I must my selfe pay the debt againe, that my sureties paiment may stand good for me. A satisfaction to apply a satisfaction, is a toy so improbable & sensletse, as that we may think them miserably put to shifts, that could find no better cloke to hide their shame. Yet this is the couer of al their poisoned cups. They multiply their witchcrafts and sorceries without end, & bring into the Church what they list lewdly to deuise, and then tell vs that these things serue to apply vnto vs the merit & passion of Christ. The sacrifice of the Masse is the propitiatiō for our sins, but it applieth vnto vs the sacrifice of the crosse of Christ. The bloud & sufferings of Saints and Martyrs are auailable for the forgiuenesse of sins, but they apply vnto vs the vertue of the bloud and sufferings of Christ. But here *M. Perkins* noted, that the meanes of application consist in Gods offering to vs, and our receiuing of him. God offereth Christ vnto vs by the word & *Sacramēts*; we receiue him by faith. He required it to be proued, that by satisfactiōs Christ is either offered on Gods part, or receiued on our part. Why did *M. Bishop* omit to do this? Why doth hee neither bring reason, example, nor authority to shew vs, that satisfaction hath any such nature or vse of applicatiō, or in what sort it should be said to apply? Wee haue shewed [e] before, that faith is as it were the hand of the soule, an instrument properly seruing for apprehending, receiuing, laying hold of, and applying to our selues: why doth not he make the same appeare to vs concerning satisfaction? But why do we require him to do more then hee can do? But here is a secret, gentle Reader, which I wish thee to take knowledge of, and if thou be acquainted with him, aske him (if occasion serue) the solution of this doubt. He telleth vs through al this discourse, that the vse of Christs satisfaction is to take away the guilt of sin, & the eternall punishment therof, & that this we obtain in the forgiuenes of our sins. But now after the forgiuenes of our sins, these satisfactions remain to be performed by vs. If this be so; if the vse of Christs satisfactiō be determined in the forgiuenes of our sins, & these satisfactions follow after, how or to what vse do these satisfactiōs apply vnto vs the satisfaction of Christ? As for example, *M. Bishop* giueth a man absolution before he dieth: he hath thereupon his sins forgiuen him, & a release from eternall punishment, but yet, being not yet throughly scoured, to Purgatory he must go. Now then in what sort, and to what

[e] Of Iustificatiō Sect. 19. 28.

what end doth Purgatory apply vnto him the ſatisfactiō of Chriſt? For the ſatisfaction of Chriſt medleth not with temporall puniſhments; he hath left the kingdome of temporall ſatisfactions & the whole reuenew thereof to the Pope. What do we heere then with applying the ſatisfactiō of Chriſt? Riddle this riddle he that can, for *M. Biſhop* cannot do it: yet he telleth vs further, that our ſatisfactiōs are to *fulfill the will & ordinance of Chriſt*, and hereupon he entreth into a goodly tale to declare vnto vs this ordinance. But his declaratiō is ſuch, as that we may ſee in him that which *Hilary* ſaid of the Arian heretikes: [f] *They thruſt in words of truth, that the poiſon of their falſhood may find entrance.* It fitteth them which *Tertullian* ſaid of the Valentinians: [g] *They faſhion their moſt vaine & filthy deuices to the holy names, & titles, & arguments of true religion.* He telleth vs, that *God in Baptiſme for Chriſts ſake both pardoneth all ſin, and taketh fully away all paine due to ſin.* But where I maruell hath he ſeene this miracle wrought? That God in baptiſme giueth full forgiueneſſe of ſins we acknowledge, but yet did we neuer find, but that baptiſme for pain & outward grieuances leaueth a man the ſame that it foūd him; ſicke & diſeaſed before, ſicke & diſeaſed ſtill; lame before, lame ſtill; blind before, blind ſtill. We ſee that infants baptized, who (he ſaith) haue no ſin to ſatisfie for, yet haue many pangs, & frets, and ſickneſſes, and how then doth baptiſme take away all paine due to ſin? *He who dieth in that ſtate*, ſaith he, *goeth preſently to heauen*: but he who dieth in that ſtate, dieth he without paine? We ſee he talketh at randon wholy by fancy, & not by reaſon, neither do his eies look which way his feet go. Well, let this paſſe: What after baptiſme? *If after wee tranſgreſſe*, ſaith he, *then loe the order of his diuine iuſtice requires, that we be not ſo eaſily receiued againe into his fauor.* Why but the Apoſtle *S. Iohn* ſaith to them that are baptized, [h] *If any man ſin, we haue an aduocate with the Father, Ieſus Chriſt the iuſt, and he is the propitiation, or ſatisfaction for our ſins.* What is the difference then, if both in baptiſme and after baptiſme Chriſt be the attonement and ſatisfaction for our ſins? Yea ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *God vpon our repentance pardoneth the ſinne, and eternall puniſhment due vnto it through Chriſt, but doth exact of euerie man a temporall ſatisfaction anſwerable to the fault committed.* But this cannot be, [i] leaſt as *S. Hierome* ſaith in another caſe, *it bee partly a truth, and partly a lie which wee beleeue in Chriſt.* For then as touching eternall puniſhment it ſhall be a truth, that

f *Hilar. de Trin. l. 6. Ingerunt nomina veritatis vt virus falſitatis introeat.*

g *Tertul. aduerſ. Valent. Sanctis nominibus & titulis, & argumentis veræ religionis vaniſſima & turpiſſima figmenta configurant.*

h 1. Joh. 2. 2.

i *Hieron. in Eſa. cap. 53. lib. 14. Ne ex parte veritas, & ex parte mendacium credatur in Chriſto.*

that *Christ is the propitiation for our sinnes*, but as touching temporall satisfactions it shall be a lie, and we shall be said to be the propitiation and attonement for our owne sinnes. Which because it is blasphemous and wicked to affirme, neither hath the Scripture taught vs any such diuision betwixt Christ & vs, therefore we must confesse that in name of satisfaction for reconcilement vnto God, we do nothing for our selues, but Christ only both temporally and eternally is the satisfaction for our sinnes. Christ did not onely beare the infinite wrath of God; to acquite vs of eternall punishment, but according to the wordes of the Prophet cited by the Euangelist,[k] *He tooke (vpon him) our infirmities, & bare our sicknesses*, that is, our temporall punishments; which what doth it import, but that in respect of temporall punishments also Christ is our Redeemer, Christ is our satisfaction vnto God. And if not so, why do we then pray to God to bee deliuered from temporall calamities and afflictions for Christs sake? Nay, see how wickedly this deuice is framed. The bloud of Christ serueth not to acquite vs from temporall punishments, but the bloud of *S. Peter* doth, and the bloud of *Paul*, and the bloud of the Martyrs; these all are helpfull to free vs from temporall satisfactions. They pray by one Saint against the toothach, by another against the falling sicknes, by another against the plague, &c. their merits are auailable in this behalfe, but the merit of Christ auaileth nothing. And yet they tell vs, that the conclusion of all their praiers is, *Per Christum Dominum nostrum*; *through Christ our Lord*. But why do they thus bring in the mediation of Christ, if Christ in this respect haue done nothing for vs? If Christ haue left the burden of temporall satisfactions to lie wholly vpon vs, why doe they pray by him and through him to be disburdened thereof? This the Church of the faithfull hath alwaies done, and in all times. The Church of Rome therefore dealeth vnfaithfully to retaine the wordes of the faithfull, and to giue checke to the meaning of them, by denying Christ to be our Redeemer from that wrath of God, whereby temporall afflictions and punishments are laid vpon vs. As for vs wee resolue that as the disobedience of the first *Adam*, brought vpon vs not onely eternall punisiments, but also temporall, so the obedience and merit of the second *Adam*, to answer that in sauing which the other had done in destroying, hath made satisfaction to God for both, so that the faithfull penitent soule

[k] Esa. 53. 4. Mat. 8. 17.

ſoule beleeuing & receiuing in Chriſt forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, beleeueth it ſelfe to be perfectly reconciled vnto God, & reckoneth not of any further ſatisfaction to be made vnto him. Now *M. Biſhop* acknowledgeth that Chriſts *ſatisfactiō is of infinite value*, & therefore that *our ſatisfactiō is not to ſupply his*. But if it be of infinite value, why doth he reſtrain & abridge the effect thereof, in reſpect of thē to whom the infinite value of it doth belong? why doth hee make the value thereof in reſpect of the tēporall puniſhments of ſin, altogether idle & of no vſe? and if it might haue freed vs frō doing ſatisfaction for our ſelues, why doth it not? He giueth vs reaſons, *that by the ſmart therof we may be feared & made carefull to auoid ſin, & that by ſuffering, we may be cōformed as mēbers to Chriſt our head*. You ſay well *M. Biſhop*, but yet we heare nothing here concerning ſatisfaction. We require a reaſon of the aſſertion of our ſatisfactions, for that Chriſt we ſay hath yeelded a full ſatisfaction for vs, & you tell vs of being frighted frō ſin, & made conformable vnto Chriſt, which are things that ſtand very well without any matter of ſatisfaction. The Scripture teacheth vs theſe vſes of the ſufferings of the faithful, but it ſaith nothing to vs concerning ſatisfaction. But for the better vnderſtanding of this whole matter, it is to be obſerued, that the temporall calamities & euils of this life, are of thēſelues, & in their own nature, the puniſhmēts of ſin, the effects of Gods curſe, the beames of his euerlaſting fury and wrath, the forerunners of his dreadfull iudgment, preparatiōs to death, & death it ſelfe the vpſhot of al the reſt, as it were a gulfe ſwallowing vs vp into fearefull darknes, & vtter deſtructiō both of body & ſoule. Now Chriſt being 1 Ioh. 1. 29. *the lambe of God that taketh away the ſinne of the world*, in taking away our ſins, taketh away conſequently the effects of ſin, becauſe the cauſe beeing remoued, the effects cannot remaine. But in ſin, as hath been before declared, wee are to conſider both the corruption and the guilt, of which the guilt being taken away, the corruption may ſtill remaine, & the effects of ſin haue reference to both theſe. Being then reconciled vnto God through Ieſus Chriſt, by the not imputing of our ſins, wee ſee that the temporall afflictions & grieuances of this life, are ſtill continuing & lying vpon vs. Hereupon the queſtion is, our ſins beeing forgiuen, in what nature they continue? We ſay; not as ſatisfactions to the wrath of God, in reſpect of the guilt of ſin, but as cautions and prouiſions of his loue, for the deſtroying of the corruption

ruption of it. The guilt of sinne is the foundaiton of satisfaction; and where no guilt is, there is no satisfaction to be demaunded. When therefore forgiuenes hath taken away the guilt, there can be no requiring of satisfaction, & the afflictions thenceforth lying vpon vs are of another nature, and to other ends & vses, then that either we should be said thereby to satisfie God, or that God should be said thereby to satisfie himselfe of vs. The vses thereof the Scripture noteth[m] *the destroying of the body of sin*, [n] *the making of vs partakers of his holinesse*, [o] *the renewing of the inner man from day to day*, [p] *the making of vs meete to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light*. [q] *We are chastened of the Lord when we are iudged, that we should not be condemned with the world*. [r] *They serue*, saith Austine, *for the reforming of our sins, for the exercise and triall of our righteousnesse, for the setting forth of the misery of this life, that that life where shal be true & euerlasting blisse, may both more fervently be desired, and more instantly sought for.* These reasons he giueth, why the punishments of sinne as touching the matter of them continue still in this life after the forgiuenesse therof, but of satisfaction not a word. Yea, being occasioned to speake directly to the point by the Pelagians, obiecting to him, that [s] *if death had come by sin, then after forgiuenes of sinnes we should not die*, he answereth thus. *They vnderstand not that God suffereth the things, the guilt wherof he releaseth, that they may not hurt after this life, yet to remaine (in this life) for the fight of faith, that thereby we may be instructed and exercised, profiting and growing in the fight of righteousnesse.* The guilt of death then and of all other temporall calamities, is taken away, but yet these things continue, not as matters of satisfaction, but as meanes of instruction for the framing of vs vnto God. He goeth on, and saith, that *it may be as well said if for sinne it were said to man, In the sweat of thy browes shalt thou eate thy bread, and the earth shall bring forth vnto thee briars and thornes*; why after forgiuenesse of sinnes doth this labour remaine, and why doth the ground of the faithfull bring forth briars and thornes? Againe, if for sinne it were said to the woman, *In paine and sorow thou shalt bring foorth*, how is it that after forgiuenesse of sinnes faithfull women still bring foorth with the same paines? All these cases and the like he cleareth in this sort: [t] *Wee answer, that before forgiuenesse they are the punishments of sinnes, but after forgiuenesse, they are the fights and exercises of the iust.* Where wee see that being

m Rom. 6. 6.
n Heb. 12. 10.
o 2. Cor. 4. 16.
p Col. 1. 12.
q 1. Cor. 11. 32.
r Aug. de Trin. lib 13. cap. 15.
Prosunt ista mala que fideles siue perferunt vel ad emendanda peccata, vel ad exercendam probandamq; iustitiam vel ad demonstranda vitæ huius miseriã vt illa vbi erit beatitudo vera atq; perpetua & desideretur ardentius & instantius inquiratur. Vide in Ioan. tract. 124.
s Aug. de peccat. merit. & remiss. lib. 2. ca. 35. Quia dicunt, si peccato mors accidisset, non vtiq; post remissionem peccatorũ moreremur, non intelligunt quomodo res quærit reatũ ne post hanc vitam obsint Deo solui tamen ea ad certa rem fidei sinit manere, vt per illas eruditiamur & exercea mur proficientes in agone iustitiæ.
t Ibid. cap. 34. Respondemus dimitti peccata, ante remissionem esse suppliciapeccatorũ, post remissa autem certamina exercitationes fidei.

drawne

drawne to anſwer preciſely to this matter, he denieth them after forgiueneſſe to be puniſhments of ſinne, howſoeuer both he and we are woont in common ſpeech to terme them ſo, becauſe originally and naturally they are ſo. Therefore is there commonly that difference made betwixt the afflictions of the faithfull and the vnfaithfull, that [u] *that which is to the iuſt the exerciſe of vertue*, as Origen ſaith, *is to the vniuſt the puniſhment of ſinne*; that [x] *the plagues of the world*, as Tertullian ſaith, *are to the one for puniſhment, to the other for admonition and aduertiſement*. So can *Thomas Aquinas* ſay when occaſion ſerueth, that [y] *temporall euils are inflicted vpon the wicked for puniſhment, for that they are not thereby helped for the obtaining of eternall life, but to the iuſt who are thereby helped, they are not puniſhments, but rather medicines*. So then they are not puniſhments, they are no ſatisfaction where ſinnes are forgiuen, but they are referred to other ends. If they be ſatisfactions, the proper and onely vſe of them in that nature is *ex parte ante, in reſpect of time paſt*, to giue recompence for offence formerly committed; and whatſoeuer elſe is alledged, is meerely accidentall, but the proper and onely vſe of afflictions where ſinnes are forgiuen, is *ex parte poſt, in reſpect of time to come*, to keepe vs from ſinne, and to helpe forward our ſanctification towards God. But *M. Biſhop* hudleth and confoundeth all togither, and by termes of the true vſes of afflictions deliuered in the Scripture, deceiptfully coloureth his matter of ſatisfactiõs deuiſed beſide and againſt the Scripture. Let him ſpeake diſtinctly as the Scripture doth, and then he muſt ſay, that that which concerneth the guilt of ſinne, and belongeth to ſatisfaction, is laid wholy vpon Chriſt, that it may be true which the Prophet ſaith, [z] *The chaſtiſement of our peace was laid vpon him, and by his ſtripes we were healed*; but that which is laid vpon vs after forgiueneſſe by Chriſt, is onely *de futuro*, to weaken and weare away the power of ſinne, and in death which is the laſt of theſe afflictions, vtterly to deſtroy it. Now therefore whereas he ſaith, that we muſt be *conformable vnto Chriſt as members to our head*, he notably abuſeth the pretence thereof to the ſingular diſhonour of Ieſus Chriſt. He hath told vs before that we muſt be [a] *like vnto Chriſt in meriting*, and here he telleth vs that we muſt be *like vnto Chriſt in ſatisfying*: but what? muſt we be like vnto Chriſt in thoſe things wherein conſiſteth his being Chriſt? wherein ſtandeth his being our Redeemer, our Sauiour,

u *Origen. in Geneſ. hom. 16. Quod iuſtis exercitiũ virtutis eſt, hoc iniuſtis pœna peccati.*

x *Tertull. Apologet. ca. 41. Omnes ſeculi plagæ nobis ſortè in admonitionẽ, vobis in caſtigationẽ.*

a *Deo obueniunt.*

y *Thom. Aquin. 22. q. 114 art. 10. ad. 3. Temporalia mala infliguntur impijs in pœnam, in quantum per ea non adiuuantur ad conſecutionẽ vitæ æternæ, iuſtis autem qui per huiuſmodi mala iuuãtur, nõ ſunt pœnæ ſed magis medicinæ.*

z *Eſa. 53. 5.*

a *Of Merits. Sect. 16.*

our, our high Priest and Mediatour vnto God? By meriting and satisfying for vs, it is that Christ is our Christ, our Iesus and Sauiour. If therefore we be like vnto him in meriting and satisfying, what hindereth but that as he is in common Iesus, and a Sauiour for all, so we also should be said euery man to bee a Iesus and Sauiour for himselfe. Which because it is impious to affirme, and cannot bee auoided, if it be true which he saith, let him learne to know that we are to be like vnto Christ in his image, not in his office; in act of conuersation, not in effect of satisfaction and redemption; in that that he is simply according to himselfe, not in that that he is by dispensation for vs. We must suffer as he hath suffered, but not suffer for our selues, or one for another, as he hath suffered for vs. We must walke in obedience to God as he hath walked, but not to merit by our obedience for our selues, as he by his obedience hath merited for vs. These are lewd and Antichristian deuices, seruing to iustle Christ out of his place, by a pretence of conformitie betwixt him and vs. *M. Bishops* conclusion therefore is without any ground, that Christ hauing satisfied the eternall punishment of sinne, hath left a temporall satisfaction thereof to be performed by vs. As for the words of the Apostle which he citeth for some proof thereof, *Euery man shall beare his owne burden*, it had been his part to make it plaine, first that the *burden* there spoken of, is to bee vnderstood of temporall afflictions. Secondly, if it be so to bee vnderstood, he should againe haue told vs how it followeth, that those afflictions must necessarily be taken to be satisfactions. Thirdly, if they be satisfactions, it would haue bene considered how this place standeth with the doctrine and practise of the Church of Rome, which, the Apostle saying, *Euery man shall beare his own burden*, that is, if we beleeue *M. Bishop*, shall satisfie for himselfe, doth notwithstanding appoint one man to beare the burden and satisfactions of another. If euery man beare his owne burden, why doth the Pope pretend by his Pardons, to impart to one man the satisfactions of another? or if the Pope doe thereby impart the satisfactions of Saints and Martyrs to the helpe of those that want, why doth Master *Bishop* tell vs that of temporall satisfactions it is said, that *Euery man shall beare his owne burden*? But thus hee is wont to cite texts at all aduenture; be they with him or against him all is one; they helpe to fill vp a booke, and that is enough for his purpose.

b Gal. 6. 5.

But

But the meaning of those words plainely appeareth out of the circumstance of the place. The Apostle labouring to withdraw men from iudging and condemning others, and from iustifying themselues by measuring and comparing themselues to them who they condemned, wisheth euery man to consider himselfe in himself, to make triall of his owne worke, not to continue himselfe, for that he seemeth to himselfe to be preferred before another, but to endeuor without comparison to others to be approued in himselfe. To this meaning are these words; [e] *Let euery man proue his owne worke, & then shall he haue reioycing in himselfe and not in another.* For reason hereof he addeth, *for euery man shall beare his own burthen*, as if he should say: It concerneth not one man what another is: the burdening of another shall be no disburdening of thee: what is amisse in him, he shall answer for himselfe, but looke thou to thine own burden, for whatsoeuer it is thou shalt answer to God for it. The burden then which the Apostle speaketh of is, as *Thomas Aquinas* saith, [d] *the burden of our reckoning & accōpts to be made vnto God at the day of iudgment*, and his words are to the very same meaning, as elsewhere he saith: [e] *Euery one of vs shall giue account of himselfe to God.* So that *M. Bishops* argument falleth out in the end to bee this; Euery man at the day of iudgement must giue reckoning to God for himselfe. Therfore Christ hath left vs to make temporal satisfaction to God for our own sinnes. Thou must take it as it is, gentle Reader, for he can make it no better then it will bee: denie his argument, and hee hath no more to say.

e Ver. 5.

d Th. Aquin. in Gal. cap. 6. lect. 1. Onus reddendæ rationis, &c. in diuisicy.

e Rom. 14. 12.

## 3. W. BISHOP.

*Nay (saith* M. Perkins) *we must then be new Christs, and Redeemers, and Priests of the same order with himselfe. Nothing so, but hauing grace from him we may in vertue thereof satisfie not for the crime it selfe, or euerlasting punishment, which is linked with it: because that would require an infinite vertue both for the reparal paine of it, one indued with grace may satisfie; for the measure of stripes must not exceede the rate of the fault, the punishment then resting vnsatisfied being limited, a creature may pay it. And that the Reader may better perceiue what we meane by the temporall paine, let him consider that in sin are two things, the one is the turning away from God, whom we offend, the other is the tur-*

per

*turning vnto the thing, for the loue of which we offend, as for glory, lust, loue, or such like, the sinner transgresseth: now when he is by the grace of God conuerted, his turning away from God, both the sin and the eternall paine due vnto it, are freely through Christ pardoned, but for the pleasure which he tooke in the sin, the man himselfe is to satisfie; and so according vnto the greatnesse of that his pleasure, he is to do penance.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins* gaue argument and reason of that which he said; but *M. Bishop* like a reasonlesse man without giuing any reason, affirmeth that againe, against which *M. Perkins* argued. Hee rightly alleageth, that no part of the priesthood of Christ can be said to haue passed from him to vs, that to make satisfaction for sinnes whether temporally or eternally is a part of the priesthood of Christ, and therfore that it is not a thing passed from him to vs to make satisfaction for our sinnes. Against, to attribute that to vs, for which and by which Christ is Christ, our Redeemer & high Priest, is to make vs Christs, Redeemers and Priests for our selues. But to attribute to vs to make satisfaction for sinnes either temporally or eternally, is to attribute that to vs, for which and by which Christ is Christ, our Redeemer and high Priest. It is therefore the same, as to affirm vs to be Christs, Redeemers and Priests for our selues. *M. Bishop* answereth ridiculously and childishly, Not so, but Christ hath satisfied for the eternall punishment which requireth an infinite vertue: as for the temporall paine it may be satisfied by vs. But what is here for exception to our collection, whether sith the name & office of Christ, of a Redeemer and Priest standeth in satisfying for sinne, therefore if we be said to satisfie temporally for our selues, then as Christ is our Christ, Redeemer, and Priest, in respect of satisfying for the eternall punishment of our sinnes, so we are Christs, Redeemers, and Priests for our selues, in respect of making temporally an attonement for our selues. But that belongeth to the Priesthood of Christ, to make attonement for temporall punishments, is plaine in the law, where we reade that the plague being begun, the high Priest in figure of our high Priest Iesus Christ, maketh attonement for the staying of it. [a] *Take the censer*, saith *Moses* to *Aaron*, and put *fire therein of the Altar, and put incense in, and go quick into the*

a Numb. 16. 46.

Con-

*Obtreqatid. & make an atteonement for thē, for there is wrath gone out fro the Lord, the plague is begō.* He did so, *& the plague was staid.* The like we se in the plague that followed vpō *Dauids* numbring of the people, b *he offered burnt offerings & peace offerings, and the Lord was appeased towards the land, & the plague ceased fro Israel.* And hereby we vnderstand, that al the sacrifices of the law, wherin Christ was alwaies set before them, had a respect of appeasing the wrath of God not onely for euerlasting punishments in the world to come, but also for the temporall afflictions & punishments that are incident to this life. It is therefore a great impiety in the Church of Rome, to take away this part of Christs office from him, and to make euery man therof partaker to his wrong. But now whereas *M. Bishop* saith, that *it would require an infinite vertue to satisfie for the euerlasting punishment of sinne*, we would gladly know of him how it standeth, that a greater vertue is required to satisfie for the euerlasting paines of hell, then there is to merit and purchase the euerlasting ioyes of heauen. He saith, the grace of Christ giueth force to our works to deserue the one; but if that be true, by what reason doth he deny that the grace of Christ giueth force to our satisfactions to quit the other? His owne confession in the one condemneth his assertion in the other, and because he denieth that our merits of satisfaction can release from hel, he must deny that our merits of purchase are of sufficient value to deserue heauen, because the grace of God must be holden to be of the same power and vertue on both sides. Againe it is vntrue which he saith, that *the temporall punishment being limited, may be satisfied for by a mere creature*, because the satisfaction is not to be estemed according to the quantity of the temporal punishment, but according to the maiesty of him to who the offence is done, who being the same in punishing, whether temporally or eternally, can haue none of sufficient worth to deale with the one, who is not the same for the other also. He cannot in any sort merit any thing at Gods hands, who is not in worth and power answerable to his infinit greatnesse. And this *Thomas Aquinas* saw, who to make good humane satisfaction, attributeth vnto it *an infinite, in respect that it is informed by grace, & accepted thereby*, whereby we may see how well these men accord in the grounds of their defence. But *Thomas Aquinas* saw it to be an absurd fancie which *M. Bishop* here followeth in designing a *rate*, as he calleth it, of

b 2 Sam. 24. 25.

c *August. Enchirid cap. 33. Singulare sacrificium (Christi) cuius erant vmbræ omnia sacrificia legis & prophetarum.*

d *Thom. Aquin. suppl. q. 13. art 1. ad 1. Sicut offensa habuit quandam infinitatē ex infinitate diuinæ maiestatis: ita etiam satisfactio accipit quandam infinitatem ex infinitate diuinæ misericordiæ prout est gratia informata per quam acceptum redditur quod homo facere potest.*

*of sinne* to be answered by *a measure* of temporall stripes, whereas the infinitenesse of sin can beare no such limitation, nor be bounded in any sort within the cõpasse of temporall reuenge. But yet *M. Bishop* will make vs beleeue that he hath a deuice whereby to make good this *rate* and *measure*. He telleth vs that *in sin two things must be considered; the one is the turning away from God whom we offend, the other is the turning to the thing for the loue of which we offend*. Our *turning from God, both the fault & the eternall punishment due vnto it*, he saith, *are freely pardoned by Christ*, but man forsooth *must satisfie for the pleasure that hee tooke* in turning to the creature. But this idle Sophisme of his is reiected also by the same great Rabbine of theirs, *Thomas Aquinas* as a thing of nought. [e] *Some say*, saith he, *that sinne hath an infinity in respect of auerting or turning away frõ God, & so it is freely pardoned, but that in respect of conuersiõ or turning to creatures it is finite, and so may be satisfied for. But this is nothing, because satisfactiõ answereth not to sin, but according as it is an offece to God, which it hath not of conuerting to other things, but of auerting and turning frõ God*. There is a loue of the creatures which is according to God, & stãdeth with the loue of God. [f] *The creature because it is good, it may be loued aright*, saith Austin, *and it may be loued amisse: aright if order be kept; amisse if order be peruerted*. Therfore vertue & righteousnes is not a denial of the loue of creatures, but it is, as hee saith, [g] *an order in louing*. The act of sin then consisteth in disordered loue, in that the loue of the creature implieth an auersion and turning away from God. Now then seeing satisfaction is to be made by vs in respect of *auersion frõ God*, & the punishment that belongeth to *auersion frõ God*, is the eternall punishment of sin, as *M. Bishop* also saith, he must acknowledge by the doctrine of their owne schooles, that we are to make satisfaction for the eternall punishment of sin, and then let him tell vs what exception he hath yet giuen, that their doctrine of satisfactions doth not make vs Christs, and Redeemers of our selues, & Priests of the same order with the Sonne of God. But we are yet further desirous to know, vpon what ground *M. Bishop* would haue vs to beleeue, that only temporall punishments should belong to the pleasures & delights of sin, or in what sort we should conceiue the same pleasures of sin seuered from auerting & turning away from God? These are such strange deuices, howsoeuer he setteth them downe, as speciall tricks of wit, as that we should thinke him

e *Ibid. quidã dicunt quod habet infinitatẽ ex parte auersionis & sic gratis dimittitur, sed ex parte cõuersionis finita est & sic pro ea satisfacere potest. Sed hoc nihil est, quia satisfactio non respondet peccato nisi secundũ quod est offensa Dei quod non habet ex parte conuersionis sed ex parte auersionis.*

f *Aug. de ciu. Dei li. 15. ca. 22. Cùm bona sit omnis creatura & bonè potest amari & malè: bene scilicet ordine custodito: malè autem ordine perturbato.*

g *Ibid. Definitio breuis & vera virtutis ordo est amoris.*

him to haue written them in a dream, but that he vttereth so many of them, as that then wee must imagine him to liue in a continuall dreame. Must we thinke that the Apostles were acquainted with this nice conceit of his? Did they meane that Christ suffered and died for our sins *quantum ad auersionem, so farre as concerneth turning from God*, but that he left vs to suffer for our own sins, and one for anothers sins *quantum ad conuersionem, so farre as concerneth turning* to the pleasures of our sins? Surely the Prophet saith, *quantum ad auersionem*: [h] *All we like sheepe haue gone a stray*; and *quantum ad conuersionem, we haue turned euery man to his owne way*, and addeth concerning both; *And the Lord hath laid vpō him the iniquities of vs all.* But *M. Bishop* hath learned another lesson of their Schoolmen, who haue exercised their wits to mocke the word of God, for the colouring of those lewd and blasphemous nouelties, which the Romish Apostasie hath brought in, to the wrong and derogation of the crosse of Christ.

h Esa. 53. 6

## 4 W. Bishop.

But *Christ (saith M. Perkins) said* on the Crosse. It is finished: Wherefore all satisfaction was at *Christs* death ended, as well temporall as eternall.

Answer. *That those words haue a farre different sence: To wit, that Christ had then ended his course, & fulfilled all prophecies, and endured*

2 Cor. 5. *all such torments, as it pleased God to impose vpon him for the redēption of mankind: of satisfaction temporal there is no mention, neither can any thing be drawne thence against it: No more can be out of this other:* Christ made sinne for vs: *that is, the punishment of sinne, as* M. Perkins *glesseth it: but the learned say, an host or sacrifice for sinne. But we graunt that he suffered the punishment for our sinne, & say consequently: that all sinne is pardoned freely for his sake, and the paine of hell also, which is punishment of sinne: but not other temporall paines, such as it hath pleased the iustice and wisedome of God to reserue vnto euery sinner, to beare in his owne person. And after this sort, and no other was God in Christ, reconciling the world to himselfe. And that Saint* Paul *vnderstood well, that Christs sufferings did not take away ours, may be*

Colos. 1. *gathered by those his words*: I reioyce in suffering for you, and do accomplish those things that want of the Passions of Christ, in my flesh.

flesh for his body, which is the Church.

*But of this point more, when wee come vnto the Arguments for the Catholike part.*

## R. Abbot.

What our Sauiour meant by saying in the very instant of his giuing vp the ghost, [a] *It is finished*, we may cõceiue by the Apostle, making as it seemeth application of that word when he saith, [b] *With one oblatiõ he hath* [*] *consummated or made perfect for euer thẽ that are sanctified.* By that one oblation he performed whatsoeuer was necessary for our full and perfect satisfaction and reconcilement vnto God. And therein he *fulfilled all prophecies* that were written of attonement & peace to be made betwixt God & mã, the effect whereof *S. Peter* expresseth saying, [c] *To him giue all the Prophets witnesse, that through his name all that beleeue in him shall receiue remission of sinnes.* [d] *In him we haue redemption*, saith S. Paul, *through his bloud euẽ the forgiuenesse of sins.* Now as the author to the Hebrews inferreth, [e] *where remission of these things is, there is no more offring for sinne*, so may we infer, where remissiõ of sins is, there is no more satisfying for sin, because sacrifice & satisfactiõ haue one and the self same respect to sin. Seeing then Christ hath done that that yeeldeth vs perfect forgiuenes of sins, it must follow that there remaineth no further satisfactiõ to be performed for sin. And thus much is cõtained in *M. Bishops* words, but that like *Caiphas* he saith wel, & vnderstandeth not what he saith. *Christ*, saith he, *endured all such torments as God would impose vpon him for the redemption of mankind.* And what is *redemption*, but a paiment of full & perfect satisfaction? [f] *Because the passion of Christ*, saith Thomas, *was a sufficient and superabundant satisfaction for the sin of mankind & guilt of punishment, his passion was as it were a price or paiment, by which we were set free frõ obligatiõ both those waies. For the satisfactiõ wherby a mã satisfieth either for himself or for another, is called a price by which a mã redeemeth (or buieth out) himselfe or another from sin and punishment. Now Christ*, saith he, *hath made satisfactiõ by giuing himself for vs, & therfore the passiõ of Christ is said to be our redemption.* If then the passion of Christ be therefore our redemption, because he hath paid a sufficient & superabundant satisfaction to free vs from obligation of guilt and punishment,

a Iohn 19.30.
b Heb. 10.14.
* τετελείωκεν.
c Act. 10.43.
d Ephe. 1.7.
e Heb. 10.18.
f Tho. Aquin. p. 3 q. 48. art. 4. in corp. Quia passio Christi fuit sufficiens & superabundans satisfactio pro peccato & reatu pœnæ humanæ generis, eius passio fuit quasi quoddã pretium quo liberati fuimus ab vtraque obligatione. Nam ipsa satisfactio qua quis satisfacit siue pro se siue pro alio, pretium quoddam dicitur quo seipsum vel alium redimit à peccato & pœna. Christus autem satisfecit dando seipsum pro nobis, & ideo passio Christi dicitur esse nostra redemptio.

how can it ſtand that after Chriſts redemption the obligation ſhould ſtil remain, & that there ſhould be yet a further ſatisfaction to be made? Either it muſt bee ſaid that Chriſt hath not made a full redemption; or elſe it muſt be acknowledged, that Chriſt hath taken away all temporal ſatisfaction. But Chriſt in ſaying *It is finiſhed* teſtifieth that in his death he fully finiſhed our redeption. Therfore he teſtifieth that he hath left no place for any further ſatisfaction. This cannot be ſhifted off. A perfect redemption taketh away all obligation of further ſatisfaction, or elſe it cannot bee called abſolutely perfect. Chriſts redemption therfore beeing ſimply & abſolutely perfect, muſt neceſſarily inferre a deniall of temporal ſatisfaction. Albeit the very name of *temporal ſatisfaction* in this caſe is abſurd, becauſe the guilt of ſin being onely infinit & eternal, and in no ſort temporall, cannot be brought within any cõpaſſe of temporall ſatisfaction, as before was ſaid. In a word, we doe not beleeue that Chriſt plaid the Sophiſter vpon the croſſe, to ſay *quantum ad auerſionẽ. It is finiſhed*, that is, the ſatisfactiõ of ſin is fully paid, but *quantum ad conuerſionem*, al is not yet fully finiſhed, but there remaineth ſome further ſatisfaction to be made. No more do we beleeue that the Apoſtle when he ſaid, [g] *Chriſt was made ſin for vs*, did play faſt or looſe, as meaning that if we vnderſtãd ſin *quantũ ad auerſionẽ*, thẽ it is true that *he was made ſin for vs*, that is, the puniſhment or ſacrifice for ſin, but that *quantũ ad conuerſionem* we are made ſin for our ſelues, or one man for another. Or that when it is ſaid, [h] *He ſuffered for ſinnes once, the iuſt for the vniuſt, that he might bring vs to God*, the meaning is that in part he ſuffered for our ſinnes, to bring vs to God, but left vs in part to ſuffer for our owne ſinnes, to bring our ſelues to God. Wee cannot be perſwaded that that was the meaning of the Apoſtle when he ſaid, [i] *God was in Chriſt reconciling the world vnto himſelfe*, becauſe he defineth that reconcilement to conſiſt in *the not imputing of our ſins*, and how are our ſinnes not imputed if we be ſtil holden in any ſort to make ſatisfaction for thẽ? But theſe things though they be apparently blaſphemous & wicked, and do expoſe the Goſpel of Chriſt to mockery & contempt, yet *M. Biſhop* laboureth to colour with a ſentence of *S. Paul*, which for more thẽ a thouſand yeares after the time of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, neuer any man vnderſtood or expounded to that meaning whereto hee applieth it. [k] *Now reioyce I in my ſufferings for you, and do fulfill or accompliſh*

g 2. Cor. 5. 21.

h 1. Pet. 3. 18.

i 2. Cor. 5. 19.

k Col. 1. 24.

compliſh'(*thoſe things that want*, ſaith *M. Biſhop*, but the word is ὑστερήματα) *the remainder, thoſe things that are yet behind of the afflictions of Chriſt in my fleſh, for his bodies ſake, which is the Church. M. Biſhop* by tranſlating *thoſe things that want of the paſſions of Chriſt*, and applying the place to their ſatisfactions, giueth vs to vnderſtand that blaſphemy of theirs, which he will ſeeme otherwiſe to denie, that for ſatisfaction ſomewhat is wanting to the paſſion of Chriſt, ſo that the paſſion of Chriſt is not taken with them to be a full and perfect ſatisfaction and redemption. He will ſay, the old interpreter ſo tranſlateth, but becauſe the old interpreter made not that vſe of theſe paſſions in the words following, as *M. Biſhop* doth, therefore to our meaning onely, and not to his, he tranſlateth in that ſort. The afflictions and ſufferings of the faithfull are very often in the ſcripture termed [l] *the afflictions and ſufferings of Chriſt*. Chriſt is the head; we are the body. [m] *The head and the body*, ſaith *S. Auſtine*, *make one Chriſt*. He hath made vs one with himſelfe, and therefore vnder one name of [n] *Chriſt*, he comprehendeth both himſelfe and vs. Whatſoeuer then is done either to the head or to the body, the ſame is done to Chriſt. Chriſt the head hath ſuffered in himſelfe whatſoeuer was needfull for the redemption and purchaſe of that body, whereof he was to be the head. He therefore ſuffered and died *for ſinne* as a Redeemer; we as redeemed are by ſuffering to be conformed vnto him, that in ſuffering we may be ſtill *dying*, and in death it ſelfe may fully and foreuer be [o] *dead to ſinne*. Now becauſe the afflictions of the body and members of Chriſt, are reckoned to be the afflictions of Chriſt, therfore ſo long as there is any part of the body ſtill remaining to be afflicted, ſo long there is ſomewhat wanting, or yet behind of the afflictions of Chriſt. Thus *S. Auſtine* ſaith, [p] *If thou be a member of Chriſt, whatſoeuer thou ſuffereſt of them who are not the members of Chriſt, it was wanting to the paſſions of Chriſt*. And thus *S. Paul* as a member of Chriſt profeſſeth, that for his part he fulfilled the remnant, or that that was yet to be ſuſtained of the afflictions & ſufferings of Chriſt. But he addeth, *for his bodies ſake which is the Church*, and vpon theſe words ſpecially the queſtion dependeth. In what meaning is it that he ſaith he ſuffereth *for the Churches ſake*? *M. Biſhop* will haue vs thinke that it was to adde ſomewhat for his part to the common treaſury of ſatisfactions, whence reliefe & ſuccour might

l 2. Cor. 1. 10. Phil. 3. 10. 1. Pet. 4. 13.

m *Aug. in Pſa. Capnt & corpus vnus eſt Chriſtus.*

n Gal. 3. 16.

o Rom. 6. 2. 11.

p *Aug in Pſal. 61. Si in membris Chriſti es, quicquid pateris ab ees qui non ſunt in mẽbris Chriſti deerat paſſionibus Chriſti.*

be yeelded to men by the Popes indulgences, to supply the want of their owne satisfactions. We must thinke that somewhat was wanting to the suffrings of Christ, to set vs free from temporall punishments, and towards that *S. Paul* paied his shot, and hauing suffered enough for his owne discharge, would adde somwhat to serue in common to ease the burdens of other men But against this wicked and blasphemous fancie, the Apostle himselfe instructeth vs, when he saith, [q] *Was Paul crucified for you?* If we beleeue *M. Bishop*, *Paul* also was crucified for vs, but *Paul* himselfe denieth himselfe to haue bene crucified for vs. Therfore he teacheth vs to say, [r] *God forbid that I should reioyce but in the crosse of our Lord Iesus Christ.* not in the crosse of *Paul*, not in the crosse of *Peter*, but only in the crosse of Iesus Christ. If *M. Bishop* say true, we haue to reioyce in the crosse of *Peter* and in the crosse of *Paul*, and in the crosses of the rest of the Saints, as hauing redeemed vs frō Purgatory, & frō temporal pains; but we are taught to reioyce in nothing but in the crosse of Iesus Christ, that it may be true which he hath said, [t] *I haue troden the wine-presse alone, & of all people there was none with me.* Therfore *Ambrose* saith; [t] *If Christ haue died for vs, why do we impute his grace and benefit to other men to his wrong?* Very fitly to this purpose saith *Leo* Bishop of Rome: [u] *Albeit the death of many Saints hath bene precious in the Lords sight, yet the killing of no Saint hath bene the propitiation of the world. The iust receiued crownes, but gaue none, and of the fortitude of the faithfull haue growne examples of patience, no gifts of righteousnesse. Their deaths were seuerall in euery of them, neither hath any man by his death paied the debt of another mā, seeing amongst the sonnes of men it was onely our Lord Iesus Christ, in whom all were crucified, dead, buried, and raised againe.* This was the auncient doctrine of the Bishops of Rome, but now Master *Bishop* telleth vs out of their Romish learning, that one man is the propitiation and attonement for another, that some men do pay debts, and make satisfactions for others, because *Paul* saith that he suffereth for the Churches sake. But *S Austine* telleth him againe: [x] *Albeit we ought to die for our brethrē, yet no martyrs bloud is shed for the remission of the sinnes of the brethren, which Christ hath done for vs, and in that hath yeelded vs not any thing to imitate & follow, but what to re-*

[q] 1. Cor 1. 13.
[r] Gal. 6. 14.
[s] Esa. 63. 3.
[t] Ambr. of in 1. Cor. cap. 1. *Si Christus pro nobis mortuus est, quomodo gratiam & beneficium eius hominibus imputamus ad eius iniuriam?*
[u] Leo epist. 81. *Quamuis martyrum sanctorum pretiosa in conspectu Domini mors fuerit, nullius tamen infontis occisio mundi fuit propitiatio. Accepere iusti, non dederunt coronas, & de fortitudine fidelium nata sunt exempla patientiæ, nō dona iustitiæ. Singulares quippe in singulis mortes fuere nec alterius quisquam debitum suo fine persoluit, quum inter filios hominū vnus Dominus noster Iesus Christus extiterit in quo omnes crucifixi, omnes mortui, omnes sepulti, omnes sunt etiam suscitati.*
[x] Aug. in Ioan. tract. 84. *Etsi fratres pro fratribus moriamur, tamen in fraternorū peccatorum remissionem nullius iusti mors iusti mortui fusa est. Quod fecit ille (Christus) pro nobis, nec in hoc quid imitaremur sed quid gratuleremur contulit nobis, &c. Quō si quisquā se potentiæ Christi comparabit alienū se putando seruare peccatū, multum est ad illum, non capit tantū. & Dimes est qui nec hæreditario nec proprio vnquā debito obnoxius & ipse iustus est & alios iustificat Christus. Noli ergo tuum te extēdere, in tantum pauper vt remissionis peccatorum appareas quæ idcirco in oratione mendicus.*

*vice of. For if any man will compare himselfe to the power of Christ, in thinking himselfe to heale the sin of another man, it is too much for him; he is not capable thereof. He is the rich man,* saith he, *who being not subiect to any debt either hereditary or of his owne, is both iust himselfe, & iustifieth others, euen Iesus Christ. Doe not aduance thy selfe against him, beeing so poore as that thou appearest in thy praier daily a begger of the forgiuenesse of sins.* Ther is no forgiuenesse of sins then by the bloud of Martyrs; there is no ableneſſe in one man to heale the sin of another, or to pay anothers debt: euery man is poore, euery man a begger, craiuing from day to day the releaſe and remiſſion of his owne debts. This was *S. Pauls* caſe; thus he praied daily as Christ had taught him, and why then doth *M. Bishop* make him so rich, as that hee ſhould bee able to make paiment of our debts, that hee ſhould purchaſe a releaſe of the puniſhment of our sinnes, that hee ſhould take vpon him [y] *to make recompence for the wrongs that wee haue done to God, and to take away our offence* towards God, or *Gods offence and displeasure* towards vs, as their name of *Satisfaction* doth import? It was a farre other matter that the Apoſtle intended, in that hee ſaith that hee endured afflictions for the Churches ſake. It was to confirme vnto the Church the truth of the Goſpell of Chriſt; to cauſe the greater opinion of that doctrine which hee preached, in that he yeelded himſelfe for the teſtifying thereof, to hazard and beſtow his temporall life; to encourage and comfort the faithfull, to continue conſtant in the faith of Chriſt, according to the example that they had ſeene in him; to embolden other men to preach the word, notwithſtanding the oppoſition that was made againſt it. And thus doth the Apoſtle expreſſe the ends and vſes of his afflictions, [z] *the confirmation of the Goſpell,* [a] *the furthering of the Goſpell,* [b] *the defence of the Goſpell,* [c] *the magnifying of Chriſt.* [d] *If wee be afflicted,* ſaith hee, *it is for your conſolation and ſaluation which is wrought in the enduring of the ſame ſufferings which we alſo ſuffer.* Not then as to purchaſe any thing towards their ſaluation by his afflictions, but as to hearten and comfort them to the patient bearing of afflictions, in the enduring whereof God hath intended to bring their ſaluation to effect. Thus *Thomas Aquinas*, where his eies were open, conceiued both of this text, and of that to the Coloſſians which is here in queſtion, who writing vpon the words of the Apoſtle, *Was Paul crucified for you?* vſeth theſe words:

y Tho. Aquin. Supplem. q. 12. art. 2. ad 1. *Satisfactio eſt quedam illate iniurie recompenſatio.* E q. 14. *Ablatio offenſæ.* art. 1. *in corp.*

z Phil. 1. 7.
a Ver. 12.
b Ver. 17.
c Ver. 20.
d 2. Cor. 1. 6.

*This is proper to Christ, that he by his passion and death hath wrought our saluation. But it seemeth to be against this which the Apostle saith, Col. 1. Now I reioice in my sufferings for you, &c. But we are to say, that the passion of Christ was the cause of our saluation, not only by way of example, but also by way of merit and effectuall working, in that by his bloud we are redeemed and iustified; but the sufferings of others is furthering to our saluation onely by way of example, according to that 2. Cor. 1. If we be afflicted, it is for your comfort & saluation, &c.* Againe in another place propounding by way of obiection, that [f] *not only the passion of Christ, but also of other Saints was helpfull to our saluation, according to the saying of the Apostle, Col 1. Now reioice I in my sufferings for you, &c and therefore that Christ onely cannot bee called our Redeemer, but also other Saints;* he answereth thus: *We are to say that the passions of the Saints are helpfull or profitable to the Church, not by way of redemptiõ, but by way of example & comfort (or encouragement) according to that 2. Cor 1. If we be afflicted &c.* So where the Apostle saith, [g] *I suffer all things for the elects sake, that they may also obtaine the saluation which is in Christ Iesus,* hee asketh, [h] *what, was not the passion of Christ sufficient? Yes,* saith he, *as touching the working of saluation; but the Apostles suffering was two waies expedient. First, because he gaue example thereby of continuing in the faith. Secondly, because thereby the faith was confirmed, and by that meanes they were induced and drawne on to saluation.* Thus then we haue example, confirmation, comfort, encouragement in the sufferings of the Apostles and Saints, but wee cannot find any satisfaction for our sinnes. And that *M. Bishop* may know that wee speake this from better authority then onely *Thomas Aquinas*, let *S. Ambrose* tell in what sense the Apostles suffered for the Church. [i] *Peter*, saith hee, *suffered many things for the Church. Many things also* S. Paul *and the rest of the Apostles suffered when they were scourged, when they were stoned, when they were imprisoned. For by that bearing of wrongs and experience of dangers, the Lords people was founded, and the Church receiued increase, for that other hastened to martyrdome,*

[e] Tho. Aquin. in 1. Cor. cap. 1. lect. 3. Hoc proprium est Christo, vt sua passione & morte nostram salutem operatus fuerit, &c. Sed contra hoc esse videtur quod Apostolus dicit, Gaudeo in passionibus meis pro vobis, &c. Sed dicendum quòd passio Christi fuit nobis salutifera non solùm per modum exempli sed etiam per modum meriti & efficacie, in quantum eius sanguine redempti & iustificati sumus, &c. Sed passio aliorum nobis est salutifera solùm per modum exempli, secundum 2. Cor. 1. Siue tribulamur, &c.

[f] Idem p. 3 q. 48. ar. 5. vr. 3. Non solum passio Christi sed etiam aliorum sanctorum profuit ad salutem nostram, vt Col. 1. Gaudeo in passionibus meis pro vobis, &c. Dicendum quod passiones sanctorum proficiunt Ecclesiæ, non quidem per modum redemptionis, sed per modum exempli & exhortationis; secundum illud 2. Cor. 1. Siue tribulamur, &c.

[g] 2. Tim. 2. 10.

[h] In 2. Tim. 2. lect 2. Sed nunquid sufficit Christi passio? Dicendum quòd sic effectiuè; sed passio Apostoli duplicitèr expediebat. Primo quia dabat exemplum perstitendi in fide. Secundo quia confirmabatur fides & ex hoc inducebantur ad salutem.

[i] Ambros. in Psal. 43. Petrus pro Ecclesia multa toleravit. Multa etiam Paulus cæterique Apostoli pertulerunt, cùm cæderentur virgis, cùm lapidarentur, cùm in carceres truderentur. Illa enim tolerantia iniuriarum & vsu persecutionum domini fundatus est populus, & ecclesiæ incrementum est consecutus, cùm cæteri ad martyrium festinarent videntes per illas passiones nihil Apostolorum decessisse virtutibus, sed etiam propter hanc breuem vitam immortalitatem esse quæsitam.

when

*when they saw that by those sufferings there was no impeaching of the Apostles vertues, and moreouer that for this short life immortality was sought (or gotten) thereby.* In the like sort doth he expound the words of the Apostle which here we speake of: [k] *He professeth himselfe to reioice in the troubles which he endured, because he seeth his successe in the faith of thē that beleeue: for his trouble is not in vaine when he gaineth him to life for whom he suffered.* No other thing doth *Cyprian* gather out of those words: [l] *Euen as Christ*, saith he, *by his admirable testimony glorified the Father in this world & also in heauen, so his testimony is after a sort consummated or made perfect in the testimonie of the Saints, as if the passion of the Lord and of the seruants were all one.* And that no man may thinke that irreligiously spoken, S. Paul warranteth the same to vs, thus writing to the Colossians: *I now ioy in my sufferings for you, and fulfill those things which are yet wanting or behind of the sufferings of Christ in my flesh, for his bodies sake, which is the Church. For who knoweth not how plentifull increase the corne field of the Church hath yeelded, beeing watered with the bloud of the Apostles and other Martyrs? The more bloud was shed, so much more and more the multitude of the faithfull flourished; so much the wider that blessed vine spred her branches, arising from Christ her stocke, & possessing the whole world.* Afterwards going forward to shew that [m] *Christ testifying himselfe to be the good shepheard, because he gaue his life for the sheepe, hath therein giuen example to those that are the pastors in his stead to be ready to shed their bloud for the Lords flocke, vnlesse they will be taken for hirelings rather then for pastors*, he saith, that *thereto the wordes of the Apostle accord, who saying, that for the body of Christ which is the Church, he suffered the like things as the Lord suffered, he addeth; The cause why he suffered those things willingly, where of* (saith he) *I am made a minister according to the dispensation of God, which is giuen to me that I should fulfill the word of God. For as by the deaths of the Martyrs, the sufferings of Christ are perfected, so by the bloud of the Pastors the promises of Christ are confirmed. For there is no instrument more vndoubted then that which is sealed with the bloud of so*

[k] *Idem in Colos. cap. 1. In tribulationibus quas patiebatur exultare se fatetur, quia profectum suum videt in fide credentium. Non est enim inanis tribulatio quando eum pro quo patitur acquirit ad vitam.*

[l] *Cyprian. de dupl. Mart. Quemadmodum ille mirabilis testimonio clarificauit Patrem in hoc mundo, atque etiam in cœlis ita testimonium illius quodammodo consummatur testimonio Sanctorū, quasi sit vna passio Domini & seruorum. Id ne quis existimet parùm religiosè dictum beatus Paulus nobis patrocinatur, ita scribens, &c. Quis enim nescit quam uberem proventū effudit Ecclesiæ seges Apostolorum & cæterorum Martyrum sanguine irrigata? Duo plus sanguinis effusum est, hoc magis ac magis effloruit multitudo fidelium: hoc latius sparsi sunt pr. pagines illa beata vitis à Christo*

*stirpe surgens & occupans orbem vniuersum, &c.*

[m] *Testificatus est se esse pastorem bonum, quia animam suam posuit pro ouibus, nobis exemplum præbens, vt qui pro nostra qualibetque tentatione vitæ illius cernimus, parati simus & ipsi pro grege dominico sanguinem fundere, nisi malumus videri mercenarij quam pastores Domini verbis congruunt verba discipuli: Cùm enim dixisset se gaudere, &c. perpetiens & ipse pro corpore Christi, quod est Ecclesia, qualia passus erat Dominus, causam adiecit cur ea libenter pateretur. Cuius, inquit, minister factus sum, &c. vt impleam verbum Dei. Sicut ergo mortibus Martyrum consummantur passiones Christi, ita sanguine pastorum confirmantur promissi Christi. Nullum enim instrumentum indubitabilius quàm quod tot Martyrum sanguine signatum est. Hoc nimirum est implere verbum Dei, hoc est, replere Euangelium.*

*many Martyrs. This is indeed to fulfill the word of God, this is to fulfill the Gospell.* In the like sort doth *S. Austin* make construction of the words of *S. Iohn*: [n] *He laid down his life for vs, therefore ought we also to lay downe our liues for the brethren: namely,* [o] *for the edifying of Gods people, for the anouching of the faith.* Thus it was said, that [p] *the blood of Christians was like seed,* that [q] *the field of the Church beeing sowed with blood, did more fruitfully spring and grow,* whilst [r] *the Lord did grant that his seruãts by their sufferings did win their brethren;* but that the bloud of Christian Martyrs was any satisfaction for the rest of the Church of Christ, or any redemption of the punishments of their brethren, it was neuer heard of in those times. They knew nothing then of the Popes store-house of Supererogations and Satisfactions: they knew nothing of that marting, and chopping, and changing of merits which these presumptuous Romish hypocrites now maintaine, in whom it is much more verified then it was in the Donatists, which *S. Austine* saith: [s] *They arrogate vnto themselues so great righteousnesse, as that they brag not onely that they haue it themselues, but also giue it vnto others.* But to conclude this point, let *M. Bishop* know, that both hee and his fellowes are verie impudent and shameless men, thus to wrest the words of the Apostle, to the defense of a doctrine which for aboue a thousand yeeres was neuer heard of in the Church, and which haue out of the ancient Church according to the Scriptures a verie manifest and cleere exposition another way.

n 1. Ioh. 3. 16.
o *Aug. in Ioan. tract. 47. Sic & nos debemus ad edificandam plebem, ad fidem asserendam animas pro fratribus ponere.*
p *Tertul. Apol. cap. 45. in fine. Semen est sanguis Christianorum.*
q *Aug. in Psal. 58. Sanguine seminata seges Ecclesiæ fertilius pullulauit.*
r *Idem Epist. 50. Laudatur Dominus qui donare dignatus est, vt serui eius passionibus suis lucrarentur fratres suos.*
s *Idem Ep. 51. Tentant sibi arrogant iustitiam vt eam iactent se non solùm habere sed etiam alijs hominibus dare.*

## 5. W. Bishop.

*Now to* M. Perkins *second reason.* In sundrie places (*saith he*) of Scripture, wee are said to be redeemed, iustified, and saued freely: but this word freely importeth, that wee are saued without doing any thing our selues in that matter of saluation.

Answer. *Not so good Sir, for euen in your owne doctrine, it is necessary that ye beleeue, and bring forth the fruits of repentance, & that now and then, ye make some short praiers, and receiue the Communion, and doe many other odde things in that matter of saluation: wherefore the word freely doth not exclude all our working and suffering in that matter.*

R. Abbot.

R. ABBOT.

Thoſe *odde things*, as this odde companion termeth them, which we require as neceſſary in the matter of our ſaluation, are no other but either occaſions and affections of ſeeking & deſiring, or meanes of our apprehending and receiuing that ſaluation which is freely & onely by Ieſus Chriſt. We do not pray to be ſaued for our prayers ſake, nor beleeue to be ſaued for our faiths ſake, nor receiue the communion to be ſaued, or to haue our ſinnes forgiuen by vertue of our receiuing, but we pray and beleeue to haue our ſinnes forgiuen vs, and to be ſaued freely for Chriſtes ſake, and do receiue the communion for the ſtrengthening of our faith in this beleefe, Chriſt by the Sacrament offering himſelfe vnto vs with the whole benefit of his paſſion, to be receiued and made ours by faith. As for repentance conſiſting in the true feeling and acknowledging of our ſinnes, whereby we ſee our ſelues in our ſelues to be loſt and caſt away, it is the motiue and occaſion of ſeeking this ſaluation in Chriſt, and freely for his ſake, and the fruites of repentance which we require are but the way, as hath bene before ſhewed, to the full attainement and poſſeſſion of ſaluation, which we receiue by him. And further, we acknowledge that our repentance, our faith, our prayer, and whatſoeuer elſe is in vs towards God, is wholly and altogether of the gift of God, purpoſing ſaluation vnto vs of his owne free mercie, and therefore of the ſame mercie beſtowing vpon vs theſe things which he hath appointed as preparations thereunto: but to our ſelues, as of our ſelues, we can challenge no part nor parcell of any of theſe things. Therefore on our part nothing hindreth, but that we are ſaid to be redeemed, iuſtified, and ſaued freely, that is [a] *for nothing*, as *Maſter Biſhops* Maſters of Rhemes do giue the ſignification of the word *gratis*. But if *Maſter Biſhop* himſelfe had ment to deale here truly and honeſtly with his Reader, he ſhould not haue dodged in this ſort, by talking of vs without anſwering for himſelfe, but ſhould haue made it appeare, how that which he affirmeth can ſtand with that which the Scripture teacheth. If we be not ſaued but by interpoſing our merits for the purchaſe thereof, how is it ſaid, that we are ſaued freely, that is, for nothing? how can our ſins be freely forgiuen, that

[a] *Rhem. Teſtam.* explication of words in the end.

is,

is, for nothing, when they are not forgiuen but vpon condition of satisfaction? Satisfaction is the payment of a price, as we haue seen before out of *Thomas Aquinas*. Now to do a thing freely and to do it for price and paiment cannot possibly stand together. Therefore *M. Perkins* argueth rightly: If we satisfie in our owne persons, then are we not saued freely, and if we be saued freely, then we make no satisfaction at all. *M. Bishops* leisure serued him not to answer this point. We know he wanted no good wil, but in hast he was, & must needs be gone, because indeed he knew well, that he could say nothing, but that euery child would see his doubling and shifting, and descry him to be a very vaine and wilfull man.

## 6. W. Bishop.

M. Perkins *third reason*. We pray daily, Forgiue vs our sins: now to plead pardon, and to satisfie for our sins, are cleane contrarie.

Answer. *If our sins be mortall, we craue pardon both of the sin, and the eternall punishment annexed, and do willingly withall satisfie for the temporal paine: as the man who is conuicted of high treason, and hauing both his life, honor, lands and goods, pardoned and restored vnto him, doth very ioyfully indure three moneths imprisoment, and any reasonable fine set on his head. If our sinnes be veniall, then that prayer is a speciall meane, both to obtaine pardon of the fault, and release of all the paine, as witnesseth* S. Augustine, *saying*: That for the daily, short, and light offences, without which this life is not led, the daily prayer of the faithful doth satisfie, *And that is not true which* M. Perkins *adds, that we are taught in that prayer, wholy and only to vse the plea of Pardon. For in the same petition, we are taught also to pardon others, euen as we will looke to be pardoned. Againe, if there were only a plea of pardō, it would not serue* M. Perkins *purpose. For who would say, that within the compasse of the* Pater noster, *all things necessary to saluation be contained: besides, prayer is one part of satisfaction, as shall be proued hereafter, and so by oft praying for pardon, we may well satisfie for much temporall punishment.*

In Enchir c. 71

## R. Abbot.

I pray thee, gentle Reader, that with *M. Perkins* argument here

here propounded and *M. Bishops* answer to it, thou wilt compare that which *M. Bishop* himselfe before hath said: [a] *Doth not a Pardon (saith he) take away frō the fault pardoned, all bond of punishment due vnto it, and consequently all guiltinesse belonging to it? Who can deny this, vnlesse he know not or care not what he say?* Hereby then vnderstand, that *M. Bishop* here either knoweth not, or careth not what he saith: for that as a man hauing forgotten himselfe he would make vs beleeue, that the pardoning of a fault doth not take away all bond of punishment due vnto it. That which he said before is sensible and cleere to euery mans sight, but that which he saith heere is senselesse and absurd, euen in that very instance whereby he seeketh to make it good. The man who for high treason is but adiudged to short imprisonment and fine, is neuer said to bee pardoned. The prince dealeth gratiously with him in not calling him further into question, but to giue him a pardon should be to cut off both imprisonment and fine. And who was there euer in the world before the time of these ranke witted Sophisters, that made that construction that *M. Bishop* doth of our prayer which we make to God, *Forgiue vs our trespasses*; as that our meaning therein should bee to say to him, *Forgiue* vs the sinne, and the eternall punishment, but as touching the temporall punishment, wee are willing and readie to make thee satisfaction for it. When we lye groning vnder the burden of temporall calamities and afflictions, do wee not say vnto God. *Forgiue vs our trespasses*, and begge of him remission of sinnes, to the intent that by forgiuenes of sinnes we may bee eased of the same burden? The voice of Christ to the sicke of the palsie: [b] *Thy sinnes are forgiuen thee*, doth it not giue him present release from the bond thereof? *Dauid* saith, [c] *Whilest I held my tongue* (from acknowledging and confessing my sinnes) *my bones were consumed in my mourning all day; for thy hand was heauy vppon mee day and night, and my moisture was turned into the drouth of Summer, I acknowledged my sinne vnto thee, and did not hide mine iniquitie. I thought I will confesse against my selfe my wickednesse vnto the Lord, and thou forgauest the punishment of my sinne.* By which words hee giueth vs to vnderstand, that the forgiuenesse of his sinnes vpon his repentance and confession thereof, was the taking away of the grieuous malady wherwith he was so sore afflicted, & vpon experience hereof vttereth those words in the beginning of the

[a] Of orginall sinne. sect. 1.

[b] Mat. 9. 2.

[c] Psal. 32. 3.

d Ver. 1. the Psalme, d *Blessed is the man whose vnrighteousnesse is forgiuen, and whose sinne is couered: Blessed is he to whom the Lord imputeth no sinne,* as to note that one part of that blessing is to bee released from the temporall punishments that are due to sinne. Yea and to that purpose he addeth also after: e *For this,* that is, saith S. *Austin, for forgiuenes of sinnes, shal euery one that is godly make his prayer vnto thee in a time when thou maist bee found, surely in the ouerflowing of many waters they shall not come neere him.* Where by *many waters* he vnderstandeth the manifold crosses & afflictions of this life, wherwith we are tossed to and fro by reason of our sinnes, and signifieth that the godly man by obtaining forgiuenesse of sinnes, obtaineth deliuerance and freedom from the punishment thereof. Forgiuenesse of sins then is not vnderstood with reseruation of temporall satisfaction, neither doth any thing remaine in the nature of punishment to him that by repentance and faith becommeth partaker of that mercy. As for his distinction of *mortall and veniall* sinnes applyed to the petition of forgiuenes of sinnes, we know no such, neither is any such to be approued, as f before hath beene shewed. By Gods hearkening to our prayer all sinnes become veniall; if God heare not our prayer for forgiuenesse of sinnes, all sinnes continue mortall. Our Sauiour Christ knew no such difference as *M. Bishop* maketh, that God when he heareth vs crying vnto him, *Forgiue vs our trespasses,* doth forgiue vs some sinnes wholy, and othersome but in part, or that our prayer should *bee a speciall meane* in some sinnes, *to obtaine pardon of the fault, and release of punishment,* and in othersome not so. No, neither did *S. Austine* euer dreame, that God did forgiue sinnes with a reseruation of the punishment thereof: hee knew well that forgiuenesse altereth the case and nature of afflictions, as hath bene before shewed. *Maister Bishop* citeth him saying, that g *For the daily, short, and light offences, without which this life is not led, the daily prayer of the faithfull satisfieth.* But as he saith so of these daily and light offences, so he saith of other also in the next words: *It blotteth out also those from which the life of the faithfull wickedly led, but by repentance changed to better is departed, if as it is truly said, Forgiue vs our trespasses, so it be truely said, As we forgiue them that trespasse against vs that is, if it bee done which is said.* So then as it *satisfieth* for the one, so it satisfieth for the other also: as for the lesser, so for the greater, and for both obtaineth

e Ver. 6. Aug. Pro hac. Pro qua hac spe ipsa venia petaturum.

f Of iustification. Sect. 41.

g Aug. Enchir. cap. 71. De quotidianis, breuibus, leuibusq; peccatis sine quibus hac vita non ducitur, quo idcirco oratio fidelium satisfacit &c. Dolet omnino hac oratio minima & quotidiana peccata. Dolet & illa à quibus vita fidelium scelerate acta non gesta sed pœnitendo in medius mutata discedit, si quemadmodum veraciter dicitur, Dimitte nobis, &c. sita veraciter dicatur sicut & nos, &c. id est. si fiat quod dicitur.

obtaineth pardon at Gods hands. But *Master Bishop* heere doth meerely abuse his Reader by an equiuocation of the name of *satisfaction*. For *Satisfaction* with Saint *Austine*, as with all the auncient Ecclesiasticall Writers, importeth the meanes whereby wee are to intreate and obtaine of God pardon and forgiuenesse of our sinnes: but with *Master Bishop* and his fellowes it importeth a punishment still remaining *for sinnes past, and already pardoned, to be endured either in this life, or after death in Purgatorie*, as he hath before expressed in the beginning of this Chapter. Saint *Austines* meaning then is, that the daily prayer of the faithfull sufficeth to obtaine pardon at Gods hands for our daily and common trespasses, yea and for greater offences also when by repentance and amendment of life we forsake them: but no meaning hath he either that the saying of the Lords prayer, should bee a recompence to God for our trespasse, or that our trespasse beeing pardoned, there should still remaine a satisfaction to bee performed for it. Now here *Master Bishop* further denieth, that in the Lords prayer we vse onely *plea of pardon: for* (saith he) *we are taught also to pardon others euen as we will looke to be pardoned*. And what then? what, because we are taught freely to pardon others, shall wee heereupon conceiue, that God is hired by our pardoning others to giue pardon vnto vs? Our Saviour Christ noteth therby the affection of them to whom it belongeth to vse the plea of pardon: he saith not any thing to be construed to the impeachment and derogation of the freenesse of the pardon. Meekenesse and readinesse to forgiue, is [h] *a fruite of the spirit* [i] *of adoption, by which we cry Abba Father*, in the voice of which spirit only it is, that God heareth vnto vs. [k] *It is for them to say, Our Father which art in heauen*, saith Saint *Austine*, *who now are regenerate and borne againe to such a Father of water and of the holy Ghost*. If we speake not by his spirit, our voice is as the voice of strangers, and God giueth no regard vnto it. Therefore our forgiuenesse of others is not alledged as the cause for which God is moued to forgiue vs, but we present it to him as the mark of his spirit, which he hath set vpon vs, & as the token that we are his children, to whom he hath assigned it for portion to be made partakers of the forgiuenes of sins, & to whom Christ hath ministred cõfort & boldnes so to pray. His 2. exception is very vaine also: for although the Lords praier contain not al things necessary to saluatiõ, yet the

h Gal. 5. 22. 23.
i Rom. 8. 15.
k *Aug. Enchir. cap. 71. Eorum est dicere, Pater noster, &c. qui iam ex illo patre regenerati sunt ex aqua & spiritu sancto.*

Lord

prayer is the direction of all prayers necessary to saluation. Therefore *Tertullian* calleth it, as he in his manner speaketh, *I legitimam orationem, the prayer that seruеth vs for a law of praying*: and *Austin* also saith: [m] *If thou go ouer all the words of holy prayer, thou shalt find nothing (as I thinke) which this Lords prayer containeth not.* Yea *Tertullian* doubted not further to affirme, that [n] *it is the breefe summe of the whole Gospell.* Now therefore if in the Lords prayer wee aske forgiuenesse of sinnes onely by plea of pardon, then it cannot bee that we should be taught elsewhere to aske forgiuenesse vpon tender of satisfaction, which wholly ouerthroweth the name and nature of forgiuenesse. And surely *M. Bishops* vnderstanding might affoord him to conceiue, that although the Lords prayer containe not all things necessary to saluation, yet that that is there contained, receiueth no checke from any thing spoken otherwhere. As for his last exception it is most absurd, that the prayer by which we intreate God not to vrge vs to satisfaction, should it selfe bee accounted a satisfaction, as if we said vnto God, Forgiue vs our trespasse, O Lord, and yet wee do not wish thee to forgiue vs altogether freely, and for nothing; for euen by our praying we make thee amends for our trespasse. Satisfaction is defined with them to be [o] a punishment, and because prayer as *M. Bishop* telleth vs, is *one part of satisfaction*, we must vnderstād that with them it is a punishment to pray, and *M. Bishop* hauing receiued the penitents confession, and inioyning him a number of *Pater nosters*, doth enioyne him so many punishments, and maketh him in effect to say vnto God againe, O Lord forgiue me my sinnes, and that I may deserue that fauour at thy hands, I here make thee satisfaction and recompence, by enduring this punishment of praying to thee. Nay, it is scant so well: I pray thee, gentle Reader, to marke well the contriuing of this matter. The penitent commeth to *M. Bishop*, who vpon his confession giueth him absolution of all his sins, enioyning him for satisfaction and penance thus and thus to pray. So then he saith: O Lord, my sins, be forgiuen me already, but yet for a punishment, and by way of satisfaction I say vnto thee, Forgiue vs our trespasses. These are the mysteries of the fornications of the whore of Babylon, things reasonlesse, witlesse, senselesse, meer witcheries & enchantments of mens minds, such as the very common instinct of Christianitie should teach all men to detest; to discouer them, is sufficient

[l] *Tertul. de fuga in persecut. & li. de Orat.*
[m] *August. Epi. 121. cap. 12. Si per omnia precationis sanctarum verba discurras, quantū existimo nihil inuenies quod non ista dominica contineat & concludat oratio.*
[n] *Tertul. de Ora. Breuiarium totius Euangelij.*
[o] *Thom. Aquin. Suppl. q. 15. art. 15 in corp. Opus satisfactorium oportet quod sit pœnale.*

ficient to confute them. But of this *M. Bishop* telleth vs wee shall heere more hereafter.

## 7. W. BISHOP.

M. Perkins *fourth Argument is taken out of certain odde fragments of auncient writers.*

Guiltines being taken away, the punishment is also taken away. *True: he that is guilty of nothing, cannot iustly be punished: for guiltines is a binding vp to punishment (as* M. Perkins *defineth,) then if the band to punishment be cancelled, the party is freed: but all this is nothing to the purpose, for guiltines of temporal punishment doth remaine after the sin and guilt of eternall be released.* Tertul. de Bapt. Pag. 18.

Augustine *saith*, Christ by taking vpon him the punishment, and not the fault, hath done away both fault and punishment. *Iust: the eternall punishment which was due to that fault, not the temporal: as* S. Augustine *himselfe declareth*: God of compassion doth blot out our sinnes committed, if conuenient satisfaction be not on our parts neglected. De verb. Apost. ser. 37. In Enchir. cap. 70.

*To that other sentence out of him:* When wee are gone out of this world, there will remaine no compunction or satisfaction, *it is easie to answer without the helpe of any new edition: for it will be too late then to repent, and so there is no place left to compunction, that is, contrition of heart: neither consequently to confession or satisfaction: as if hee had said, before wee go out of this world there is place for both compunction and satisfaction: and so that place is rather for vs.*

*Now* to Chrysostome, *who saith*, That God so blotteth out our sins, that there remaines no print of them: which thing befals not the body: for when it is healed, there remaineth a scarre; but when God exempteth from punishment, hee giues thee iustice. *All this is most true, and much against* M. Perkins *doctrine of the infection of orginall sin, but nothing touching satisfaction: for we hold, that the soul of a sinner when he commeth to be iustified, is washed whiter then snow: so that there is no staine or print left in it of the filth of sin. It also freed frõ all eternall punishment, but not from some temporall. Now gentle Reader, prepare thy self to behold a proper peece of cosinage.* Ambrose *saith* I reade of Peters teares, but I reade not of his satisfaction. *The co-* Tom. 10. hom. 5. Prem. in Esa. Luk. 22.

*lour of the craft lieth in the ambiguity of this word*, satisfaction, *which is not alwaies taken for the pennāce done to satisfie for the former fault, but is sometimes vsed for the defence and excuse of the fact. So speaketh*
Act. 24. 10. S. Paul, Bono animo pro me satisfaciam, *with good courage I will an-*
1. Pet. 3. *swer in defence of my self, or giue you satisfaction: in like maner*, Ready alwaies to satisfie euery one that asketh you reason of that hope which is in you. *In this sence doth S.* Ambrose *vse the word, as is most plainly to be seene to them that read the place and confer it with the ve-*
Lib. 10. *in Luc.* *ry like of his*, I find not (*saith he*) what *Peter* said, but I find that he wept: I reade his teares, but I reade not his satisfaction: but that which cannot be defended, may be washed away. *So that nothing is more manifest, then that satisfaction in this and the like places is take for defence and excuse of his fault, which* Peter *vsed not, but sought by teares and bitter weeping to satisfie in part for it: for this bewailing of our sinnes is one Specialikind of satisfaction, as S.* Ambrose *testifieth,*
Lib. 2. *de penit. cap. 5.* *saying*, That he who doth penance, must with teares wash away his sinnes. *The other place cited of S.* Ambrose, De bono mortis, let vs adore Christ, that he may say vnto vs, feare not thy sinnes, nor the waues of worldly sufferings, I haue remission of sinnes, *is rather for vs then against vs: for if by adoring and serving of God we may bee put out of feare of our sins and the punishment of them, then doth it follow, that prayers and such like seruice of Christ, doth acquit vs of sinne, and satisfie for the paine due to them.*

In Psalm. 31. Hierome *saith*, The sinne that is couered, is not seen; not being seene, it is not imputed; not being imputed, it is not punished.

Answ. *To wit, with hell fire: which is the due punishment of such mortall sin whereof he speaketh: or sin may be said to bee couered, when not onely the fault is pardoned, but all punishment also due vnto it is fully payd.*

*So doth S.* Ambrose *take that word couered saying*, The Prophet
Lib. 2. *de penit. cap. 5.* calleth both them blessed, as well him whose iniquities is forgiuen in Baptisme, as him whose sinnes are couered with good workes. For he that doth penance, must not onely wash away his sins with teares, but also with better works couer his former sins, that they be not imputed vnto him.

*Now we must backe againe vnto* Chrysostome, *belike he had for-*
From 44. *sup.* Lin. h. *gotten this when he cited the other, or else this was reserued to strike it dead. He saith*, Sam. [illegible]

the life to come: others in this life alone: others alone in the life to come: other neither in this nor in the life to come: there alone as *Dives*, here alone as the incestuous Corinthian: neither here nor there, as the Apostles and Prophets, as also *Iob* and the rest of this kind, for they endured no sufferings for punishment, but that they might be knowne to be conquerers of the fight.

Answer. *Such excellent holy personages sufferings as are mentioned in the Scriptures, were not for their sins; for they committed but ordinary light offences, for which their ordinary deuotions satisfied abundantly. The great persecutions which they endured, were first to manifest the vertue and power of God, that made such fraile creatures so inuincible: then to daunt the aduersaries of his truth, and withall to animate and encourage his followers. Finally, that they like conquerers, triumphing ouer all the torments of this life, might enter into possession of a greater reward in the Kingdome of heauen. All this is good doctrine, but nothing against satisfaction, that their surpassing sufferings were not for their owne sinnes. And thus much in answer vnto* M. Perkins *arguments against satisfaction.*

## R. Abbot.

Against his answer to the words of *Tertullian*, I must vrge his owne words in the section before alledged; *Doth not a pardon take away from the fault pardoned all bond of punishment due vnto it, and consequently all guiltinesse belonging to it? Who can denie this, vnlesse hee know not or care not what he say?* Now then put these together. *Tertullian* saith, [a] *The guilt being taken away, the punishment is also taken away.* But the pardoning of a sinne saith *M. Bishop*, taketh away *all guiltinesse belonging to it.* Therefore consequently it taketh away all the punishment: for where there is no guilt, no punishment can bee. Yes saith *M. Bishop*, *guiltinesse of temporall punishment doth remaine after the sinne and guilt of eternall bee released.* But then a pardon doth not take away *all the guiltinesse* of sinne, as before he saith it doth. *Oportet mendacem esse memorem: A lyer must bear a braine.* Againe, wee would know some ground whereupon we may be assured that sinne hath two kinds of guilt; for wee conceiue but one onely guilt whereby

[a] Tertul. de baptismo. Exempto reatu eximitur & pœna.

the sinner is guilty of all, both temporall and eternal punishments. Otherwise wee may with as good warrant affirme guilt of infinite sorts; one whereby a man is guilty of burning, another whereby he is guilty of drowning, another for the gowt, another for the palsie, and for euery seueral punishment a seuerall guilt; & that there may be a remitting of one of these guilts, & yet a retaining of the other. If *M. Bishop* take this to be absurd, he must giue vs leaue to take him for an absurd man in thus seuering the guilt of temporall and eternall punishments. Yea and this assertiō of his is the denying of that that in the ground of this question is supposed and confessed. For if the sinne be *past and pardoned*, as he saith at first, how remaineth there any *guilt*? for what is the pardoning of a sinne but the remitting of the guilt? The guilt is a bond, wherby wee stand bound to punishment; the forgiuing of the sinne, what is it but the releasing or loosing of this bond? If the bond be released, why doth he affirm that we are bound still? or if we be still bound, why doth he affirme the loosing of the bond? If he will say that the bond is partly released, and partly standeth still, then let him say, the sinne in part is pardoned, but not wholy, and then let him shew vs what warrant he hath, that God in that sort forgiueth sins by patches and peeces, which because hee cannot do, let him giue vs leaue to take him for that that he sheweth himselfe to be.

The words of *Austin* are meerely deluded with the same shift.

b *Aug. de verb. Dom. ser. 37. Suscipiendo pœnam & non suscipiendo culpam ei culpam delevit & pœnam.*

b *Christ* (saith he) *by taking vpon him the punishment, and not taking vpon him the fault, hath done away both the fault and the punishment.* *Iust*, saith *M. Bishop, the eternall punishment, not the temporall.* But how doth hee warrant this limitation in one part of the sentence which cannot be iustified in the other? Where it is said that Christ *hath taken vpon him the punishment*; it is vnderstood of our punishment both temporall and eternall, though that which should haue bene eternall to vs, by the infinit power of his Godhead was ouercome and made temporall to him. Was it S. *Austins* meaning then to say, that Christ hauing taken vpon him our whole punishment, hath deliuered vs only from a part, and left the rest to be satisfied by our selues? Surely what Christ tooke vpon him for vs, from the same he deliuered vs. He tooke vpon him our temporall punishments: therefore hee hath taken away our temporall punishments, so that they remaine not in the nature of punishments

but

but of medicines, to them that haue obtained forgiueneſſe of ſinnes by faith in him. That the mediation of Chriſt extendeth to the remitting of temporall puniſhments, I haue ſhewed [c] before, and therfor need not ſtand here any longer to confute this improbable and vnlikely gloſe. As for the place of *Auſtine* which he alledgeth for colouring hereof, it hath his anſwer in the former ſection, being the next words to thoſe that are cited there. [d] *God hath giuen to no man a freedome to ſinne, albeit the ſinnes that are alreadi committed he in mercie bloteth out, if conuenient ſatisfaction be not neglected.* Here is *ſatisfaction* firſt, and thereupon the *blotting out of ſinne*, but *M. Biſhop* telleth vs of the blotting out of ſinne firſt, and of a ſatisfaction required after. Why doth he wilfully abuſe his Reader, to make ſhew of prouing that to which he alledgeth nothing? The thing that he ſhould proue is, that God remitting the ſinne and the eternall puniſhment, doth reſerue the making of a temporall ſatisfaction, and he bringeth in *Auſtine* requiring conuenient ſatisfaction for the remitting of the ſinne. His argument then if we will frame it, muſt be this; We muſt vſe conuenient ſatisfaction vnto God for the obtaining of the forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes. Therefore after that our ſinnes be forgiuen vs, we are ſtill to make a temporall ſatisfaction vnto God; which if it be not a good one, we may take him to be ſtarke naught. Of the name of ſatisfaction I ſhall ſpeake further in the laſt ſection; here it is enough briefly to obſerue, that the *conuenient ſatisfaction* ſpoken of by Saint *Auſtine*, is no conuenient argument for Popiſh ſatisfaction. The other place cited from him, is a flat deniall of ſatisfaction after this life, [e] *When we are gone out of this world, there will not remaine any compunction or ſatisfaction.* *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that there remaineth ſatisfaction though there remaine no compunction; but *S. Auſtine* ſaith, there remaineth neither compunction nor ſatisfaction. But although *M. Biſhops* whole drift tend to that that I haue ſayd, yet I wiſh thee gentle Reader, to obſerue here how pretily he circumuenteth himſelfe. *After this life* (ſaith he) *there is no place left to compunction, that is, contrition of heart, neither conſequently to confeſſion of ſatisfaction.* If becauſe there is no place for compunction in this life, therfore there be no ſatisfaction after this life, why doth he tell vs in the beginning that after this life there is *ſatisfactiō to be made in purgatory if we die before we haue fully ſatisfied here?*

[c] Sect. 2 & 3.

[d] *Auguſt. Enchirid. cap. 70. Nemini dedit laxamentum peccandi quamuis miſerando deleat iam facta peccata, ſi non ſatisfactio congrua negligatur.*

[e] *Homil. 3. Cùm de hoc ſeculo tranſierimus, nulla compunctio vel ſatisfactio remanebit.* Some read, *vel aliqua ſatisfactio*, which muſt be reſolued thus, *Non vlla compunctio vel ſatisfactio aliqua remanebit*, or elſe the diuiſion leaueth place to compunction and repentance after this life, which opinion *Auſtine* there inueigheth againſt. and *M. Biſhop* himſelfe heere diſclaimeth.

why do they make men beleeue, that for the dead satisfaction may be made by them that are aliue? There is satisfaction, he saith, after this life, and he saith there is no satisfaction after this life, and thus indeed knoweth not what to say. But yet he telleth vs, that *S. Austine* thereby acknowledgeth that *before we go out of this world, there is place both for compunction & satisfaction, & so that place* (saith he) *is rather for vs.* Wel, but what he gaineth in the scabberd, he loseth double in the dagger. If Purgatory sink into hell, they are in a woefull case. It is Purgatory satisfaction specially that they haue their liuing by. Now against Purgatory satisfaction he giueth vs this argument: where there is no place for compunction, there is no place for satisfaction. But in purgatory there is no place for compunction. Therefore there is no place now left for Purgatory satisfaction. As for satisfaction in this life, in such sort as *S. Austin* speaketh of it, we denie it not. Satisfaction is nothing else with him but true repentance, as shall be shewed hereafter; and we preach repentance, not according to the illusiõs of Popery, but according to the truth of the word of God.

The next words are cited out of *Chrysostome*, for which is noted *Proœm in Esaiam.* Others citing the same work, do set downe what they cite, as *ex Hypomnemate in Esaiam.* But the words are by my copy in his third homily *de pœnitentia*, and they do indeed irrefragably ouerthrow *M. Bishops* satisfactions. [f] *Say not vnto me, I haue sinned: how shall I be freed from so many sinnes? Thou canst not, but thy God can: yea and he will so blot out thy sinnes, that there shall remaine no print of them. Which thing befals not the body, for when it is healed, there remaines a scarre, but God so blotteth out sinnes, as that there remaineth no scarre nor token of scarre, no print or signe at all, but after deliuerance from punishment he giueth thee iustice, and maketh the sinner equall to him that hath not sinned, for he extinguisheth sinne & maketh it not to be, yea as if it had neuer bene.* Which words are apparently spoken of actuall sinnes, [g] *The act whereof is past*, as *S. Austine* saith, *with the time wherein they are done, but the guilt remaineth, till by pardon it be remitted.* Now God so remitteth it, saith *Chrysostome*, as that *no print thereof remaineth.* If *no print thereof remaine*, if it be *as if it had neuer bene*, how doth *M. Bishop* then tell vs, that after forgiuenesse there remaineth still a guilt of temporall punishment? This is the point; why did he not answer to it? why doth he turne his

f Chrysost. de pœnit. hom. 3. Neque mihi dixeris, permultum peccaui, quomodo saluus esse possum? Tu ne quæsieris, sed Dominus tuus potest. atque ita potest, vt tua deleat peccata. Sic enim delet peccata Deus, vt neque eorum vestigium maneat. In corporibus quidem id non est vsu. sed quemquem millies conetur medicus cicatrix remanet: Deus autem sic delet vt neque cicatrix neque cicatricis superstit indicium, non vestigium quodquam, sed post pœnæ liberationem & institiam inserit, & peccatũ eo ipso tollit non peccauit. Extinguit enim peccatum atque id non esse facit nec fuisse.

g Aug. de nupt. & concup. lib. 1. cap. 26. Eorum peccatorum quæ manere non possunt, quoniam cum fiunt præterunt, reatus tamen manet, &c. Rem est donec reatus ipsius indulgentia remittatur.

his ſpeech from actual ſinnes whereof the place is meant, to originall ſinne whereof it cannot be meant? becauſe though he tell vs that originall ſinne remaineth not, yet he cannot denie but that ſome ſcarre or ſigne thereof remaineth in the concupiſcence of the fleſh. But *Chryſoſtome* denieth the remaining of any ſcar or ſigne, which can no otherwiſe be true but onely in actuall ſinnes whereof nothing but the guilt remaineth, and which by remiſſion is perfectly done away. But that originall ſinne, though the guilt be remitted, yet as touching the corruption continueth ſtill, hath bene ſufficientle ſhewed before in the handling of that queſtion.

As touching the place of *Ambroſe*, I will not gainſay that which *M. Biſhop* anſwereth. *Ambroſe* ſaith as *M. Perkins* alledgeth, [h] *I reade of Peters tears, but his ſatisfaction I reade not*: but *ſatisfaction* is not there taken in that meaning whereof we ſpeake. He meaneth indeed that he vſeth no apology, no excuſe or anſwer for himſelfe, but yeelded himſelfe with teares to the acknowledgment of that that he hath done amiſſe. The word of *ſatisfactiõ* is here very vnproperly vſed, and therefore may very eaſily be miſtaken, without any purpoſe of coſinage or fraud. I might as well obiect coſinage here to *M. Biſhop*, who taking vpon him to make good his anſwer by another place of *Ambroſe*, alledgeth for another place the very ſame which *M. Perkins* cited. But *Ambroſe* hath the words indeed in another place in one of his [i] ſermons, and therefore we will not charge *M. Biſhop* here with coſinage, there being other wiſe euery while occaſions enow to diſcouer him to be a coſiner. As for that which he ſaith, that *Peter ſought by teares and bitter weeping to ſatisfie in part for his faule*, we take him to deale very abſurdly in that he ſhould go about to make the Apoſtle ſo abſurd, as to thinke the ſhedding of a few teares to be any part of the redemption of ſo great a ſinne. The Apoſtles teares were no part of Popiſh ſatisfaction, but the tokens of true repentance, lamenting the wound, but ſeeking the cure onely in the ſatisfaction of the croſſe of Chriſt. As for that which he alledgeth from *Ambroſe*. that [k] *he that repenteth muſt with his tears waſh away his ſin*: he needed not for that phraſe to haue gone ſo far, he might haue found it in the places [l] before alledged. But he ſpake therein as we many times do, not as thinking the teares of the bodie to be the waſhing away of the ſinnes of the ſoule, but as to note that the weeping and teares of faith

[h] *Ambroſ. in Luc. lib. 10. cap. 22. Lachrymas eius lego, ſatisfactionem non lego.*

[i] *Ser. 46. Lachrymas eius lego, ſatisfactionem non lego. Recte plane Petrus flenst & tacuit, quia quod deſleri ſolet, non ſolet excuſari.*

[k] *De pœnit. lib. 2. cap. 3. Qui pœnitentiam agit, non ſolum deluere lachrymis debet peccatum ſuum, ſed etiam, &c.*

[l] *In Luc. lib. 10. cap. 22. Lauant lachryme delictum quod vox pudor eſt confiteri: & idem habet ſerm. 46.*

do obtaine of God the washing away of our sinnes in the bloud of Iesus Christ. In the other place *S. Ambrose* saith thus: [m] *Let vs seeke Christ in our last times, let vs embrace his feete, and worship him, that he may say vnto vs, Feare not: that is, feare not for the sins & iniquities of the world; feare not for the waues of bodily sufferings, I am the forgiuenesse of sinnes.* So long as there is necessity of punishment, especially such a [n] hellish punishment as they say is in Purgatory, so long there is iust cause of feare. But *S. Ambrose* telleth vs heere, that Christ by forgiuenesse of sinnes taketh away all occasion of feare; that in our sinnes and iniquities hee leaueth vs nothing to be afraid of. It followeth therefore, that after forgiuenesse of sinnes there is no further punishment, no further satisfaction to be made. Heere *M. Bishop* againe putteth off his Reader with a dodge: If (saith he) *by adoring and seruing of God wee may bee put out of feare of our sinnes and the punishment of them, then do it follow that praiers and such like seruice of Christ doth acquite vs of sin, and satisfie for the paine due to them.* Which is as leaden an answer as if a man should say, If by intreating & praying the Physicion I obtaine of him a medicine whereby I am cured, then my intreating and praying is the very medicine it selfe by which I am cured. For what do we seeke Christ, worship him, embrace him, desire him, pray vnto him, but to be releeued, succoured, comforted and saued by him, that in him we may haue satisfaction and remission of our sinnes? What madnesse is it then to make our seeking, our worshipping, our praying, to be themselues the satisfaction that we professe to seeke in him? But such madnesse doe they runne into, who will not submit their right mindes to the obedience of the faith of Christ. In the next place followeth *Hierome*. [o] *That which is couered, is not seene; that which is not seene, is not imputed; that which is not imputed is not punished.* He speaketh it for exposition of the words of *Dauid*, [p] *Blessed is the man whose vnrighteousnesse is forgiuen, and whose sinne is couered; blessed is he to whom the Lord imputeth no sinne.* Now if the forgiuing of sinne be not the imputing of sinne, then where sinne is forgiuen, there is no punishment, because there is no imputation of that to which the punishment is due. *That which is not imputed, is not punished. To wit*, saith *M. Bishop, with hell fire.* But that answer will not serue his turne: for if it be any way punished, it cannot be said not to be imputed: for whence ariseth the punishment but

[m] *De bono mortis. cap. 12. Nos eum in temporum fine quæramus, et complectamur pedes eius, & adoremus eum, vt dicat & nobis. Nolite timere, id est, nolite timere à peccatis sæculi, nolite timere ab iniquitatibus mundi, nolite timere á fluctibus corporalium passionum; ego sum peccatorum remissio.*

[n] *Bellar. de pœnit. lib. 4. cap. 1. Pœna illa quæ luenda restat post culpæ remissionem est illa ipsa pœna sensus quam in gehenna pati debuisset peccator, remota sola hac æternitate.*

[o] *Hieron. in Psal. 31. Quod tegitur non videtur: quod non videtur, non imputatur: quod non imputatur nec punietur.*

[p] *Psal. 32. 1.*

but from the imputation of the sinne? Now of *not imputing S. Austine* telleth vs, that [q] *when sinne is not imputed, a man is taken as if he had neuer done it.* So saith *S. Bernard*, that [r] *what soeuer God hath determined not to impute, it is as if it had neuer bene.* If it be as if it had neuer bene, if a man be taken as if he had neuer done it, how then doth *M. Bishop* tell vs, that there is still a satisfaction and punishment to be endured for it? But therefore he bringeth vs another answer, such as for which he deserueth to be admired for a wise & well learned man. *Sinne may be said to be couered when not onely the fault is pardoned, but also all punishment due vnto it is fully payed.* So then whereas in briefe *Hierome* saith, *The sinne that is couered is not punished*: his meaning must be, that it is not couered till it be fully punished: nay he is made directly to contrad & himselfe, & to say, *The sinne that is punished, is not punished.* Would not a man thinke him to be out of his right wits that maketh such wrong constructions of plaine words? As for the words of *Ambrose* which he bringeth in, what is there in them concerning punishment after the pardon of the fault? He speaketh of *couering former sinnes with better workes*, but of couering them with punishment he saith nothing. And as for that which he saith, though at large it may be construed well enough, yet according to the exact truth of Scripture it is vntrue, namely that *sinnes are* vnderstood there *to be couered with good workes*, as is plaine by that the Apostle witnesseth, that the Prophet in that place describeth [s] *the blessednesse of the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousnesse without workes.* But the true *couering of sinne* is that which *S. Bernard* speaketh of, when in one place he saith that [t] *the loue of the Father*, and in another place that [u] *the righteousnesse of Christ couereth the multitude of our sins.* And of those words of *Dauid*, it shall be worth the while to heare what Saint *Austine* saith, and to consider how well *M. Bishops* answer accordeth therewith. [x] *Because all is imputed to grace* (saith he) *and not to our merit, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiuen and whose sinnes are couered. Not in whome no sins are found, but whose sinnes are couered. They are couered, they are hidden, they are abolished. If God haue couered sinnes, hee looketh not on them; if he looke not on them, he mindeth them not; if he mind them not, he will not punish them: he will take no knowledge of them, he chuseth rather to forgiue them.* If forgiuenesse of sinnes be such, as that God thence-

forth

[q] *Aug. in Psal. 118 Si quid à deuiante commutatur propter viam non imputatur, & tanquam non fuerit operatus accipitur.*

[r] *Bern. in Cant. ser. 23. Omne quod mihi ipse non imputare decreuerit, sic est quasi non fecerit.*

[s] Rom. 4. 6.

[t] *Bernar. in Cant. ser. 23. Charitas patris ipsorum cooperit multitudinem peccatorum.*

[u] *Ibid. serm. 61. Iustitia tua in me operit multitudinem peccatorum.*

[x] *Aug. in Psal. 31. Quia totum gratiæ imputatur non meritis nostris beati quorum, &c. Non in quibus non sunt inuenta peccata sed quorum tecta sunt peccata. Cooperta sunt, tecta sunt: abolita sunt. Si texit peccata Deus, noluit aduertere; si noluit aduertere, noluit animaduertere; si noluit animaduertere, noluit punire: noluit agnoscere, maluit ignoscere.*

foorth loketh not on them, mindeth them not, taketh no knowledge of them, puniſheth them not, let vs know that that which *M. Biſhop* ſaith is an vntruth, that hee ſtill reſerueth ſharp & ſeuere puniſhment both in this life and in the life to come to bee inflicted for them.

The force of the ſaying of *Chryſoſtome* which is the laſt, ſtandeth in this, that he denieth that *the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and holy men endured their ſufferings for puniſhments, but that they might be known to be conquerers in the fight.* The place ſheweth that the afflictions of the righteous and faithfull haue not the nature of puniſhments, but lie vpon them for other reſpects, & therefore not being in the nature of puniſhments, they cannot be accounted for ſatisfactions. *M. Biſhop* anſwereth, that *they were no puniſhments for their owne ſinnes.* And why? *for they* (ſaith he) *committed but ordinary light offences, for which their ordinary deuotions ſatisfied abundantly.* A very dapper, but a verie fond ſpeech of a remorſleſſe man, whoſe heart yet hath neuer felt what the burden of ſinne is. Good Lord, how lightly doth he trip ouer with *ordinary light offences*! Surely the redeeming of thoſe light offences required the ſhedding of the bloud of the Sonne of God; & is it ſo lightly to be skipped ouer, for which the Sonne of God ſhed his moſt precious bloud? Tuſh, ſaith *M. Biſhop, their ordinary deuotiõs did abundantly ſatisfie for their ſins.* Belike they were proud hearted as he is: they would not be beholding to God, they would not die in his debt; what they owed him they would pay themſelues for themſelues, being rich enough, and well able to diſcharge all. But will he make thoſe holy men as very fooles as himſelfe, that they neither knew God or themſelues, but would thinke their ordinarie deuotions to be ſufficient ſatisfaction for their ſins? No, no, they knew well that after all their deuotions they ſtood in need of Gods mercy, that they had ſtill to cry, *Forgiue* vs our debts, *Enter not into iudgement* with vs: that all their merites were but droſſe, and all their ſatisfactions were but dung if they were oppoſed againſt the iudgment of God, as to ſhield them from their ſins. But *M. Biſhop* yet addeth more: *It is nothing againſt ſatisfactions, that their ſurpaſſing ſufferings were not for their own ſins.* And why? becauſe we muſt vnderſtand forſooth, that though they were not ſatisfactions for their owne ſinnes, yet they were ſo for other mens, and in that reſpect are called *ſurpaſſing*, as namely exceeding

ceeding the measure of their owne sins. This is that impious monster of Romish apostasie, whereby they haue put the Saints in Christs place, and taught men to seek for that redemption in them which they shou'd seeke for and find in him alone. But we would gladly know of *M. Bishop*, where those *surpassing sufferings* of *Iob* and of the Prophets and other holy Saints of old were layd, before the storehouse was built at Rome? what vse were they put to? who was the dispencer and disposer of them? What, was there a Pope then also to send pardons flying about the world to fetch one soule out of Purgatory for the *surpassing sufferings* of another? Or shal we think that they lay idle al that while, that the whole harueſt of the towards the end of the world might be brought together into the Popes barnes? The high Priest of the Iewes was ouerseene, that he did not take vpon him to be Pope of Ierusalem, for of these *surpassing sufferings* he might haue raised much thrift. Wicked cautiues, that thus delude men with blasphemous tales and lies, who thus defile the innocent bloud of the *Sonne* of God, by mingling with it the leprous and corrupted bloud of sinfull men. They all thought wholly and onely to be redeemed by Christ, and must we thinke now in part to be redeemed by them? They knew themselues by their sinnes guiltie of eternall suffering, and must we now thinke their sufferings to be beyond their sinne? But against this blasphemie, sufficient hath bene said before; albeit it is in it selfe so grosly impious and loathsome, as that the very mention of it is enough to make all Christian hearts to detest them that are the teachers of it.

## 8. W. Bishop.

*Now to the reasons which he produceth for it. And albeit he like an euill master of the camp, range our arguments out of order, placing that in the fore front of our side, which* Caluin *presseth ours against vs, yet wil* Lib. 3. instit. cap. 4. num. 29. *I admit of it, rather then brake his order.*

1. Moses according to Gods commandement prescribed seuerall sacrifices for the sins of seuerall persons, and ordained that they should be of greater and lesser prices, according vnto the diuersitie of the sinnes. *Whence we argue thus: These mens faults vpon their true repentance, ioyned with faith and hope in Christ to come, were pardoned: Therefore their charges in buying of sacrifices to be offered for them* Leu. 4. 5. 6.

their

*their paines and prayers in assisting, during the time of the sacrifice, being painful works done to appease Gods iustice, were works of satisfactiō.*

M. Perkins *answereth many things, as men do commonly when they cannot well tell what they say directly to the purpose: First, that those sacrifices were types of Christs suffering on the crosse: what is this to the purpose? Secondly, that those sacrifices were satisfactions to the congregation: and what needed that, when they had offended God onely, and not the congregation, as in many offences it happeneth? Againe, if satisfaction must be giuen to the congregation, how much more reason is it that it be made to God? Reade those Chapters, and you shall finde that they were principally made to obtaine remission of God, as these words* Leuit. 4. ver. 20. *also do witnesse*: And vpon that sacrifice, the sinne shall be forgiuen them. *So that sacrifices were to satisfie God, who thereupon forgaue the sinne, and all paine due to it.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Bishop* belike had no great conceit of this argument of theirs, and therefore was angry that *M. Perkins* should disgrace them by putting it in the first place. Ilfauouredly it is propounded, and ilfauouredly maintained, but yet such learning it is, as he with great paines hath brought from Rome. The foundation that he layeth is a lie, and the building that he setteth vpon it, a ridiculous consequence. He telleth vs, that *Moses* prescribing by the commaundement of God seuerall sacrifices for seuerall persons, *did ordaine that they should be of greater & lesser prices, according to the diuersity of the sinnes.* But where is that ordinance? why doth he not exemplifie that which he saith? where do we finde in *Moses* law, that for such or such a sinne, greater or lesse, shall be offered a sacrifice of such or such greater or lesser price? Surely he is little acquainted himselfe in *Moses* law, and some Register or other gaue him a gudgeon at Rome, and made him beleeue that the Popes *Taxa pœnitentiaria*, whereby euery sinne is rated at a certaine price, was framed according to the same law of *Moses*, and according to the prices of the sacrifices prescribed therein. We reade there indeed of diuers sacrifices, as in sinnes of ignorance [a] *for the Priest a yong bullocke*, [b] *for the whole congregation the same*; [c] *for a ruler a he goate*; *for any of* [d] *the people a she goate*; [e] *for any consecrate thing by errour withholden*

a Leuit. 4. 3.
b Vers. 14.
c Ver. 22 23.
d Vers. 28.
e Chap. 5. 15.

a

*a ramme of two shekels;* [f] for other trespasse against holy things ignorantly done, *the same;* for [g] sinne wittingly committed, the same also; for the high [h] Priests yearly offering for himself and his house, *a bullocke and a ramme;* and for the whole people [i] *two hee goates and a ramme.* This diuersitie we reade, and some few other such like, but of sacrifices of greater or lesser price, according to the diuersity of the sinnes, we reade nothing, it is a thing that *Moses and Aaron* neuer knew. Well, let that go, let vs see what argument hee hath framed against vs. *These mens faults* (saith he) *vpon their true repentance, ioyned with faith and hope in Christ, were pardoned. Therefore their charges in buying of sacrifices, their pains and prayers in assisting during the time of the sacrifice, being painefull workes, done to appease Gods iustice, were workes of satisfaction.* O what paines heere was for the appeasing of Gods iustice, to stand by and pray whilest the sacrifice was offering! Such cruell paines doth *M. Bishop* impose vpon his penitents for their sweet sins, that a man may sweare they are the worse for it all their life after. Vaine man, was this a paines to be spoken of, for the satisfying and appeasing of the iustice of God for sinne? But to let this passe, if [k] *the honest man,* of whom *M. Bishop* hath spoken before, should out with a little Latin, and tell him here, *M. Doctor, negatur argumentum,* how foully wold he be grauelled, and so set at a *Nonplus,* that he could not tell which way to turne him? What, because they that offered the sacrifice with true repentance in the faith of Christ were pardoned, doth it therefore follow that their charges and their paines were the satisfactiō for their sins? The *honest man* would tell him, good sir, you erre by assigning a wrong cause; for it was not for his charges and his paines that he was pardoned, but for his faith in Christ. He laid not his hand vpon himselfe, as to lay his sinne vpon himselfe, but [l] *he laid it vpon the head of the dumb beast,* as in figure of Iesus Christ, [m] *vpon whom the Lord would lay the iniquities of vs all.* Therefore his sacrifice, if hee offered it aright, was onely a profession of the hope of redemption by Christ, & he was therby instructed in him alone to expect full satisfaction and forgiuenesse of his sinnes. Now thus in effect *M. Perkins* answered him, and hee reciting the answer by halues, asketh, *What it this to the purpose?* Very much it is against his purpose, if in the sacrifices themselues there were nothing else but a direction to seeke satisfaction in Iesus Christ. [n] *The Law had*

f Ver. 18.
g Chap. 4. 6.
h Chap. 16. 3.
i Ver. 5.
k Of the certainty of saluation, sect. 2.
l Leuit. 1. 4.
m Esa. 53. 6.
n Heb. 10. 1.

*the*

*the ſhadow of good things to come, and not the (liuely or ſubſtantiall) image of the things themſelues.* Therfore no ſatisfaction indeed, but onely a ſhadow of ſatisfaction to come was to bee found therein.

o Ver. 4. For o *it was vnpoſſible that the bloud of buls and goats ſhould take away ſin.* And therfore the Law *was* p *aboliſhed for the weakneſſe and vnprofitableneſſe of it.* How ſhould it be ſaid to be *weake*, or why ſhould it be called *vnprofitable*, if *ſatisfaction* for ſins were to be found in it? Albeit in ſome meaning *M. Perkins* acknowledgeth in them *a ſatisfaction*, not to God, but to the Church of God, as teſtimonies of their repentance, and of their deſire to bee reconciled to God and men. *What needed that*, ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *when they had offended God onely, and not the congregation, as in many offences it happeneth?* I anſwer him, that becauſe all men are ſinners, euery man was by theſe ſacrifices to giue acknowledgment thereof as touching himſelfe, and to ſhew his care to be reconciled to God, either for publike or priuate offences, whereby hee had with *Achan* prouoked Gods wrath againſt his people as well as againſt himſelfe. Vpon the doing whereof, men were accounted to the Church and with men, as ſanctified and cleanſed from their ſinnes, and no exception was to be taken againſt their ioyning themſelues to the Church. And therefore for warrant of this diſtinction the Scripture teacheth, that thoſe ſacrifices did q *ſanctifie as touching the purifying of the fleſh*, that is, outwardly to men, but r *to ſanctifie the conſcience*, to acquit the conſcience of ſinnes, it reſerueth as a thing peculiar to the bloud of Chriſt. But, ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *if ſatisfaction muſt bee giuen to the congregation, how much more reaſon is it that it bee made to God?* True, but what are we ſinfull wretches, that we ſhould think that any thing that we can doe ſhould bee a ſatisfaction to him for ſinne? But much more abſurd are we to think, that the offering of a bruit creature ſhould bee any part of the redemption thereof. Our ſatisfaction therefore is not any thing that wee do or can doe, but it is onely the pleading of a ſatisfaction payed for vs in the bloud of Chriſt. Yet he ſtill vrgeth, that *ſacrifices were to ſatisfie God, becauſe it is ſaid, that vpon the ſacrifice the ſinne ſhall bee forgiuen.* But I haue already anſwered him, that it was forgiuen not for the ſacrifice ſake, but for Chriſts ſake, whom the offerer was to vnderſtand therein. And we know, that of Sacraments vſually thoſe effects are ſpoken which properly belong to thoſe things whereof

p Chap. 7. 18.

q Heb. 9. 13.

r Ver 9. 14. & Chap. 10. 1. 2.

whereof they are sacraments. It is rightly said by *Tertullian*, that *God* in these sacrifices [f] *required not the things which were done, but that for which they were done.* And therefore as *Origen* saith, as touching the high Priests standing forth to appease the wrath of God, when the Angell was gone forth to bee the executioner thereof, [t] *The destroying Angell would not haue bashed at the high Priests garments made of purple, and wool, and silke, but he vnderstood those garments that should bee of the great high Preiest (Iesus Christ) and to them he yeelded:* euen so we are to conceiue that the wrath of God was no whit nor in any sort pacified by those sacrifices for the things themselues that were done therein, but hee respected in them the bloud and sacrifice of his onely begotten Sonne, and therto was content to yeeld him selfe satisfied & appeased towards them that offered with faith in him.

[f] *Tertul contrà Marc lib. 3. Non quæ fiebant exigens sed propter quod fiebant.*

[t] *Origē. in Num. hom. 9. Neque enim indumenta Pontificis purpura & lana & bysso contexta eruluisset Angelus ille vastator, sed ista quæ fictura erant indumenta magni Pontificis intellexit & ijs cessit.*

## 9 W. BISHOP.

*The reason for vs (which indeed is the very groundwork of satisfaction) may thus be framed: many after pardon obtained of their sins, haue had temporall punishment layed vpon them for the same sinnes, and that by Gods owne order: wherefore after the forgiuenesse of the sin, and the eternall punishment of it through Christs satisfaction, there remaineth some temporall paine, to be endured by the party himselfe for the same sin, which is most properly that which we call satisfaction. They denie that any man hath bene punished temporally for any sin which was once pardoned: wee proue it first by the examples of the Israelites, whose murmuration against God, was at* Moses *intercession pardoned; yet all the elder sort of them, who had seen the miracles wrought in Ægypt for their deliuerance, were by the sentence of God depriued of the sight of the land of promise, and punished with death in the wildernesse for the very same their murmuration. The like iudgement was giuen against* Moses *himselfe and* Aron, *for not glorifying God at the waters of contradiction: both of them had their sin pardoned, yet were they both afterward for the same debarred from the entrance into the holy land.*

Numb. 24.

Numb. 20. Deut. 32.

*To this* M. Perkins *answereth, first, that a man must bee considered in a two fold estate, as he is vnder the Law and as hee is vnder grace. In the former state all* [illegible] *curses of the Law in the latter,*

*they*

*they are turned vnto thē that beleeue in Christ, from curses into trials, corrections, preuentions, admonitions, instructions, and into what you wil else, sauing satisfaction. Now to the purpose. Whereas God (saith hee) denied the beleeuing Israelites, with* Moses *and* Aaron, *to enter into the land of Canaan, it cannot be proued that it was a punishment or penaltie of the law laid vpon them: the Scripture hath no more but that it was an admonition vnto all ages following, to take heede of like offences, as* Paul *writeth,* All these things came vnto them for examples, and
1. Cor. 10. were written for our admonition.

Reply. *He that will not be ashamed of this audacious assertion, needs not to care what he saith. Hath the Scripture no more of their fact, then that it was an admonition to others? Turne to the original places, where the whole matter in particular is related: First their murmuration then* Moses *intercessiō for them, and the obtaining of their pardon, & lastly after all the rest, Gods sentence of deprivation of them from entring into the land of promise, for that their murmuratiō. Again,* Aron *shal not*
Numb. 14. Num. 20. Ve. 24. Deut. 32. 51. *enter into the land, because he hath bin disobedient to my voice: and of* Moses, Because he hath trespassed against me at the waters of strife. *So that nothing is more cleare, euen by the testimony of the holy Ghost, then that their daies were shortned, and their hope of entrance into the land of promise cut off, in punishment of those offences, which wer before forgiuen them. And these things being recorded, as S.* Paul *testifieth, for our admonition and instruction, we are to learne thereby, that God so dealeth daily with all those sinners that he calleth to repentance.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Bishop* here maketh a hot and a long harueſt, and all his corne will not yeeld him so much as one morsell of bread. He telleth vs that the argument which he here handleth is *the very ground worke of satisfaction*: now if the ground work faile, we may be wel assured that the building cannot stand. We deny indeed that any affliction or iudgement of God hath lien vpon any faithful man in the nature and condition of a punishment after the forgiuenesse of his sinne. The things themselues, which in their owne nature are punishments, and at the first are inflicted in that nature, yet the sinne being forgiuen, lose that nature, and become onely trials, preuentions, admonitions, instructions; neither do we therin conceiue Gods

Gods anger against vs, but his fatherly goodnesse, and prouidence & care to keepe vs to himselfe, that he may make vs partakers of eternall life. Thus carnall concupiscence being of it selfe a punishment of sinne, though according to the guilt it be taken away by remission of sins, yet according to the thing it selfe remaineth in the faithfull, not now for a punishment, but for the humbling and exercising of vs, to make vs to know our selues, to draw vs to trust & confidence in God, to sharpen our desire & loue of that righteousnesse for which we fight in fighting against it. So death of it selfe the wages of sin, becometh to the faithful as a poison broken into a medicine, and as a serpent that hath lost his sting: [a] *There is nothing but song*, saith S. *Bernard*, *man now dieth singing, and singeth dying. O thou mother of mourning*, saith he, *thou art turned to ioy: thou enemy of glory doest now serue to giue glory; thou gate of hel art vsed for an entry to the kingdom of heauen, and thou pit of destruction for the finding of saluation.* S. *Austin* saith thereof, that [b] *God inflicted death for the punishment of sin, and after forgiuenes of sins he still left it for the exercising of righteousnesse, that*, saith he, *the fortitude of righteousnesse might bee exercised in ouercoming the feare therof.* The like hath beene noted out of him [c] before concerning other iudgements laid vpon mankind in the beginning, by reason of sinne. Now as of these, so of all other afflictions after forgiuenesse of sinnes, wee resolue that they forgo their former condition and property, and cease to be retengements and punishments for sinne, but haue other respects and vses for which they are continued. The examples so strongly vrged by *Master Bishop* make nothing against this. First, the Israelites murmure, God to *Moses* threatneth wholy to destroy the, promising to make of him a mighty people. *Moses* prayeth vnto God to withhold that wrath from his people, & to forgiue the trespasse. God saith, [d] *I haue forgiuen it, according to thy request*: but he addeth, *Notwithstanding as I liue all the earth shal be filled with the glory of the Lord: for all those men which haue seene my glory & my miracles which I did in Egypt & in the wilderues, & haue tempted me these ten tymes, and haue not obeyed my voice, certainly they shal not see the land wherof I sware vnto their fathers.* Here is the forgiuenes of a sin, saith *M. Bishop*, and yet a punishment ensuing after. But wee answere him, that this example altereth the question, & cometh not within the compasse of that wherof we speake. For it is one thing to speak

a Bern. in Cant. Ser. 26. Iam non stimulus sed inhibitus. Iam cantando moritur homo & morituro cantat. Vsurparis ad lasciuiam mater marroris, vsurparis ad gloriam gloriæ inimica: vsurparis ad introitum regni porta infera & fauces perditionis ad immutationem salutis.

b Aug. de pec. mer. & remiss. li. 2. cap. 34. Mortem corporis propter peccatum hominis Deus inflixit, & post peccatorum remissionem propter exercendam iustitiam non adimit. Et paulò prius: eam fidelibus euenire, vt eius timore vincendo exerceatur fortitudo iustitiæ.

c Sect. 2.

d Num. 14. 20.

of the forgiuenesse of a sinne to the whole body of a people, and another thing to speake of forgiuenes to one particular man. Forgiuenesse of a sinne to a whole people is not absolute, but onely in a respect: it is not simply the taking away of a sinne, but the taking of it away in some sort, and therefore though it be the excluding of one punishment, yet nothing hindreth, but that it may leaue place for another, yea and though in common there be a forgiuenes, yet in particular there may still remaine an imputation of the sin, euen as amongst this people were many reprobates and cast-awayes, who though they were forgiuen and freed in respect of the destruction then threatned, yet being void of repentance and true faith, found otherwise spiritually no benefit at all of this forgiuenesse. God saith not here simply, I haue forgiuen it, but *I haue forgiuen it according to thy request.* *Moses* request was according to Gods threatning; Gods threatning was wholy to destroy that nation. In this respect God said, I haue forgiuen it, namely so, as not at once to destroy this people according to my wrath and indignation conceiued against them. And this *Lyra* very well obserued: [a] *He saith well* (saith he) *according to thy request, because he did not wholy pardon it, but onely as touching the not destroying of the whole people at once.* Now albeit in this respect he did forgiue it, because he did not wholly forgiue it, therefore he voweth to glorifie himselfe throughout all the earth, by making them an example of his iudgement vpon vnthankfull men, with whom no sights nor sayings can preuaile to make them obedient to the voyce of God. Therfore he would forbeare to destroy them in that sort; and to their seed he would make good the promise of the land of Canaan, but as for them he would weare out the whole multitude of them, that not one of them shold haue the enioying or sight thereof. This he laid as a iudgement in common vpon that generation of men, which had so infinitely fro time to time prouoked him, as that they made him [t] *to sweare that they should not enter into his rest* qut yet in the bosome of that multitude we cannot doubt but many there were, who truly repented & obtained forgiuenes both of this & of all their other sins, & yet together with the rest were depriued of entrance into that holy land. For God doth not except particular men from generall and common plagues, and when he striketh a nation with famin, sword, pestilence or other calamity; both one and other, good and bad are subiect

[a] *Lyra in Num. cap. 14. Bene dicit iuxta quadam totaliter dimisit, sed quantum ad hoc quòd non deleret totum populum simul.*

[t] *Psalm. 95. 11.*

subiect vnto it. [g] *We are shut vp together in one house*, saith *Cyprian*, *and whatsoeuer befalleth within the house we suffer it all alike*. Onely he so ordereth, that what is to a nation in common for reuenge and punishment, becommeth in particular to the repentant and faithfull a helpe and furtherance of saluation. And so was it with the beleeuing Israelites, who though by a common iudgement they were excluded corporally from the Sacrament and signe, yet were thereby spiritually edified, and learned with *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, & *Iacob* so much the more to meditate, to desire & long for the spirituall and euerlasting rest. Albeit in respect of the faithfull also it is to bee vnderstood that Gods chastisements oftentimes lye vpon them after forgiuenesse of sinnes, though not for punishments to themselues, yet for exemplary admonitions to others, [h] *that* (as *Thomas Aquinas* speaketh,) *they may be edified by the punishment that were scandalized by the sinne*. And thus *S. Austin* rightly saith that [i] *the punishment is continued longer then the sinne, lest the sinne should be esteemed but small, if the punishment should bee ended together with it*. And this *M. Perkins* well obserueth in generall concerning that example of the Israelites, that God though his iudgment proceeded not one way, yet would haue it to be seene another way, though not for punishment to them that repented and beleeued, yet for example to future times to take heede of cutting themselues off by vnbeleef and disobedience from the heauenly rest, as these had done from the seale and Sacrament thereof, the Apostle to that purpose saying: [k] *These things came to them for ensamples, and are written to admonish vs vpon whom the ends of the world are come*. Now as we conceiue in generall of the faithfull of that people, so wee do in particular of *Moses* and *Aaron*. *M. Bishop*, vrgeth it set down, that therfore they entred not *because they trespassed, because they were disobedient*. And who maketh doubt, but that their trespasse and disobedience was the originall cause of the debarring of them? But stil we say that the cause of this debarring of them being forgiuen, the effect still continued for other vse: which in them was not onely morall, but also mysticall, God willing thereby to giue to vnderstand, that the Law, which was giuen by [l] *Moses*, and the priesthood that was executed by *Aaron*, could not bring vs to that eternall inheritance which was figured by the land of Canaan, but only Iesus, who was figured by *Iosuah*, could yeeld vnto vs the possession thereof. Thus *S. Austin*

[g] *Cyprian. contra Demetr. Intra vnam domum boni & mali interim continentur: quicquid intra domum committit pari sorte perpetuatur, &c.*

[h] *Tho. Aquin. 2a 2æ q 87. art. 6. ad 3. Vt adificentur in pœna, qui scandalizati sunt in culpa.*

[i] *Aug. in Iosu. tr. 124. Productior est pœna quàm culpa, ne parua putaretur culpa, si cum illa finiretur & pœna.*

[k] *1 Cor. 10. 11.*

make the mystical and spirituall application thereof, affirming that *Moses did not bring the people of Israel into the land of promise lest the law which was giuen by Moses not to saue, but to conuict the sinner, should be thought to bring vs into the kingdome of heauen.* But fully to answer this point and to stop *M. Bishops* mouth, let vs take that which the same *S. Austin* saith in another place: "*We seeke Gods punishment in Moses*, saith he, *and he had but a maner more, but that God at last saith to him, Go vp into the hill and die. He saith to an old man, Go die: he had now finished his yeares: what should he neuer die? what punishmet is this? He shewed him there his punishmēt, in that he said: Thou shalt not enter into the land of promise, to which the people was to enter. Moses did here beare a figure of some: for he being to enter into the kingdom of heauen, was it a great punishment not to come to that land which was promised, for a time to carry a shadow, and so to passe away? Did not many vnfaithfull men enter into that land? did not they that lined in that land cōmit many euils and offend God? did they not follow idolatry in that land? A great matter it was not to giue this land vnto Moses: but Moses was to beare a figure of them which are vnder the law, because the law was giuen by Moses: and he sheweth that they which would be vnder the law, and would not be vnder grace, should not enter into the land of promise. Therefore that which was said to Moses was a figure, not a punishment: what punishment was it to an old man to die? what punishmēt was it, not to enter into that land, into which vnworthy men did enter?* Here then it is plain, that the not suffering of *Moses* to enter into the land of Canaan, was not a matter of punishmēt, but a matter of figure. God took the occasion ther of of his trespasse, but the trespasse being remitted, it was turned from being a punishment to him to be a mystery of faith both to him and vs. But it were worth the while here to question with *M. Bishop*, how he should make the not entring of all these into the land of Canaan, to be any satisfaction for their sinnes: what did they or suffred they, that might carry the name of a satisfaction? Did any thing herein befall them, but what befel to many iust and godly Fathers before that time? He saith, *their daies were shortened*, but how were the daies of *Moses* and *Aaron* shortened, when the one liued to [n] 120. and the other to [o] 123. yeares, almost double to that nūber of yeres which *Moses* noted for the ordinary

time.

1. August. contra Faust. Manich. l. 16 cap. 19. Non introducebat populū in terram promissionis, ne videlicet lex per Mosen non ad saluandū sed ad cōuincendū peccatorē data in id ducere putaretur. Ita Tertullianus. Marcionem lib. 3. & Idem in Psal. 98. Quærimus vindictam in Moyse, prope nullā habet nisi quod ad extremum ait illi Deus, Ascende in montē & morere. Ait ergo, Morere, ideo pergeras ætates suas: nunquid nunquā erat morituras? Qualis illa vindicta? Ostendit ibi vindictam suam vs diceret, Non intrabis in terram promissionis quam intraturus erat populus. Quandā figuram quorundā gerebat Moyses. Nam qui in regnū cœlorum intrauit magna illa pœna erat ad terram illam non venire quæ ad tempus erat promissa vmbram ostendens & transiens? Nonne multi perfidi intrauerunt in illam terram? Nonne in illa terra viuēdes multa mala fecerunt & Deum offenderunt? Nonne & idolatriam secuti sunt in terra illa? Magnū erat non dedisse terram illam Moysi, sed Moyses voluit gestare figuram eorum qui sub lege erant: quia per Moysen data est lex. & ideo dictum est eis qui sub lege esse volunt, & sub gratia esse nolunt non intrabitis in terram promissionis. Ergo illud quod dictum est Moysi figurabat, non pœnam. Quæ mors quæ pœna? Non intrare in illam terram quæ pœna quo intrauerunt indigni? n Deut. 34. 7. o Num. b. 33. 39.

time of the life of him, [p] *The dayes of our age are threescore yeares and ten.* Yea *Moses* was so old, as that he said, [q] *I am a hundred and twentie yeares old: I can no more go in and out.* Againe, we wonder, whereas *M. Bishop* hath told vs before, that *such excellent holy personages by their ordinarie deuotions satisfied abundantly for their sins*, how it came to passe, that all *Moses* deuotions for the space of eight and thirty yeares after, could not satisfie for that one sinne of his, but that it still hindred him frō entring into the promised land? Surely, *M. Bishop* cannot well tell vs how these things hang together. But to conclude this point *M. Perkins* had set downe by the words of the holy Ghost, the vse of Gods chastisements towards his children, and *M. Bishop* as loth to be acquainted therwith, saith nothing of it. [r] *When we are iudged we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world.* The occasion thereof is our sinne, [s] *For this cause many are weake and sicke amongst you, and many sleepe*: but the vse thencefoorth is not for satisfaction but for saluation, *that we may not be condemned with the world.*

[p] Psal. 90. 10.
[q] Deut. 31. 2.
[r] 1. Cor. 11. 32.
[s] Ver. 30.

## IO. W. BISHOP.

*Now to the next example, which* M. Perkins *maketh our third reason. King* Dauid *was punished for his aduoultrie after his repentance, for the child died, and was plagued in the same kind of incest by* Absolon: *and when he had numbred the people, he was after his owne repentance, punished in the death of his people.*

2 Re. 12.
2 Re. 24.

M. Perkins *answereth, that the hand of God was vpon him after his repentance: but those iudgments which befell him, were not curses to him properly, but corrections of his sinnes.*

Reply. *What dotage is this, to graunt the very same thing, which he would be thought to deny: but yet in other termes, that the simple (whom onely he can beguile) may not perceiue it: if the hand of God were vpon* Dauid *correcting him for his sin, and that after his repentance: did not* Dauid *then suffer temporall punishment for his sinnes before forgiuen? which is most properly to satisfie for them. Yea ouer and beside this punishment inflicted by God, he of his owne deuotion performed farre greater satisfaction, by putting on sack-cloth, lying on the bare ground, by watering his couch with teares, and making ashes his food, & in this most pitifull plight, he made most humble supplication vnto God, to wash him*

*more and more from his iniquity: he neuer dreamed that this his satisfaction should be any derogation vnto the satisfaction of his Lord and Sauiour: but in the Psalme saith:* that such an humble and contrite heart, is a sweet sacrifice vnto God. *We denie not but the punishing of one, is a warning and admonition vnto another, to take heed of the like: so may not they deny, but that correction is to the party himselfe, as an admonition to beware afterward, so a correction and punishment of the fault past. Which* S. Augustine *vpon this verse of the Psalme,* Thou hast loued truth, *teacheth most plainly saying:* Thou hast not left their sinnes whom thou didst pardon, vnpunished: for thou before didst so shew mercy, that thou mightest also preserue truth: thou doest pardon him, that confesseth his fault, thou doest pardon him, but so as he do punish himselfe: and by that meanes both mercy and truth are preserued.

Psal. 50.

Psal. 50.

R. ABBOT.

This matter concerning *Dauid* was answered long ago by *S. Austin* against the Pelagian heretikes, who hauing set downe for a rule of the chastisements and afflictions of this life, that [a] *before forgiuenesse they are punishments of sinnes; after forgiuenes, the combats & exercises of the iust,* as before was said, bringeth for example thereof this that *M. Bishop* here obiecteth concerning *Dauid.* [b] *Such a matter,* saith he, *is insinuated vnto vs concerning the Patriark Dauid, to whom the prophet being sent, and threatening vnto him the euils, that by the wrath of God should befall vnto him for the sinne that he had committed, by the confession of his sinne he obtained pardon, & yet those things followed which were threatened, that he should be so humbled by his sonne. Why did God fulfill that, when he had forgiuen the sinne? We axe to answer, that the sinne was forgiuen, lest the man should be hindred from eternall life: but the effect of the threatening followed, that the pietie of the man might be exercised and proued in that humiliation.* Here was iust occasion giuen to Saint *Austine* to haue mentioned *Master Bishops* satisfaction if he had knowne it, but he knew it not, and therefore said nothing of it. He denieth *Dauids* afflictions after forgiuenesse to be punishments: he maketh the vse of them to be thencefoorth onely for combate and exercise and triall of his pietie and faith. Therefore in calling them corrections as from a fa-

a *Augest. de peccat. mer. & remis. lib. 2. ca. 34 supra Sect. 2.*

b *Tale aliquid nobis insinuatur de Patriarcha Dauid, ad quem cum Prophet a missus esset, eiq; propter peccatum quod commiserat enuntiara mala & iracundia Dei comminaretur, confessione peccati veniam meruit, & tamen consequuta sunt quæ deus fuerat comminatus: vt sic humiliaretur à filio &c. Cur d misso peccato quod erat minatus implenit? Respondebitur remissionem peccati factam homini à percipiendæ vitæ impediretur æterna, subsecutum verò illius comminationis effectum, vt pius hominis in illa humilitate exerceretur atq; probaretur.*

ther

ther in respect of time to come, not punishments as from a Iudge in respect of time past, we say nothing but what Saint *Austine* saith. As for *Danids* mourning afterwards, expressed in the one and fiftieth Psalme, it was the testimonie of his true repentance, the expressing of his desire to be disburdened of his sinne, and to be established by the grace of God, that hee might not in such sort fall againe. His [c] fasting and lying on the earth, were to intreat the Lord for the sparing of the childs life: but in nothing that he did do we find any dreaming of satisfaction. He knew well that it was a derogaion to the satisfaction of Christ to seeke in himselfe that satisfaction that was to be sought for in Christ alone. He knew, that [d] *a broken & contrite heart is a sweet sacrifice to God*, but yet he knew it not to be a sacrifice propitiatorie for the sinne of man. It is not it selfe a satisfaction for sinne, but only the disposition of him who seeketh to find satisfaction in the Sonne of God. And this *broken and contrite heart* grieuing and sorrowing for sinne, is that punishment whereof Saint *Austine* speaketh in the wordes which Master *Bishop* citeth, and which he calleth *the punishing of a mans selfe*, and is the affection wherewith wee are to seeke forgiuenesse at Gods hands. Which when wee are careless of, God striketh vs with his roddes and punishments to worke it in vs, and to make vs seeke the forgiuenesse of our sinnes. This the Apostle giueth to vnderstand when he saith, [e] *If we would iudge our selues, we should not be iudged of the Lord*, as if he should say, that because we iudge not our selues therefore doth the Lord iudge vs, that thereby wee may be taught to iudge our selues. Thus our sinne is punished that it may be forgiuen, but after forgiuenesse thereof Saint *Austine* denieth (as we haue heard) that any thing remaineth as a punishment for sinne, neither doth this place import any thing otherwise. As for the other instance that he vseth concerning the plague inflicted for the numbring of the people, it was more for the punishment of the people, then of *Dauid* himselfe for the numbring of the people, though by *Dauids* numbring of them God would take the occasion of it. Therefore the storie saith: [f] *The wrath of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moued Dauid against them, in that hee said: Go number Israel and Iudah.* Here therefore necessary it was, and standing with the glorie of God by *Danids* praier, that the sin of the people shold be forgiuen as well as *Danids* sin. *Dauid* praied

c 2.Sam.12.16.

d Psal.51.17.

e 1.Cor.11.31.

f 2.Sam.24.1.

for them. Hee offered a burnt offering as it were to tender vnto God the mediation of Iesus Christ, that for his sake hee might bee mercifull vnto them. Vpon this it is said: g *The Lord was appeased towards the land, and the plague ceassed from Israel.* This maketh plainely against *M. Bishop*, because it prooueth directly, that the forgiuing of the sinne was the staying of the plague, not that the plague continued after the forgiuenesse of the sinne.

g Ver. 25.

## 11. W. BISHOP.

*Our fourth reason: The Prophets of God, when the people were threatened with Famine, the Sword, the Plague, or such like punishments for their sinnes, did commonly exhort them to workes of penance, as fasting, praier, haire-cloth, and the like, to appease Gods wrath iustly kindled against them: which being performed by them, God was satisfied. So (for example sake) the Niniuites at* Ionas *preaching, doing penance in sack cloath and ashes, turned away the sentence of God against them.*

M. Perkins *answereth, that famine, the plague, and such like scourges of God, were not punishments of sinnes, but corrections of a Father.*

Reply. *This is most flat against a thousand expresse texts of the Scripture; which declare, that for the transgressions of Gods commandements, he hath sent those punishments vpon the people of Israel. And what is the correction of a father, but the punishing of a shrewd sonne for some fault committed, yet in a mild sort? Or doth the Schoole-master (which is* Caluins *example) whippe the scholar, or strike him with the Ferula, but to punish him for some fault? So that great Rabbins seem not to vnderstand what they say thẽselues, when they admit those scourges of God to be the corrections of a Father, but not the punishment for a fault. As though fathers vsed to correct those sonnes who neuer offended them: or masters to beat such scholers as commit no faults.*

*But saith* M. Perkins, *these punishments be tending to correction, not seruing for satisfaction: what senslesse ryming is this? by due correction of the fault, the party is satisfied in iustice: and when he that hath offended doth abide such punishment as the grieuousnesse of his offence did require, there is both due correction of the offender, and due satisfaction vnto the party offended.*

M. Per-

M. Perkins *finally fleeth vnto his old shift of imputatiue satisfaction: that forsooth our sufferings doe not satisfie, but the party punished by faith laieth hold on the satisfaction of the Messias, and testifie the same by their humiliation and repentance.*

Reply. *As we first grant that all satisfaction hath his vertue from the grace of God, dwelling in vs, which is giuen vs for Christs sake: so to say that Christs satisfaction taketh away all other satisfaction, is iust to beg the principall point in question, & therefore an old triuants trick to giue that for a finall answer, which was set in the beginning to bee debated: looke vpon the forenamed example of the Ninuites, of whom it is not certaine that they had any expresse knowledge of the Messias, and therefore were farre enough off from laying hold on his satisfaction. But most certaine & euident it is in the text, that God vpon the contemplation of their works of penance, took compassion on them, and was satisfied; as by turning away the threatned subuersion, is most manifest.*

R. Abbot.

IT is an old saying [a] *Propter quod venimus, hoc age; Do that that we come for. M. Bishop* buildeth heere beside his *groundworke.* Hee propoundeth a *satisfaction* to bee made *for sinnes past and pardoned,* that is, after the forgiuenesse of the sins, and bringeth vs arguments to prooue a satisfaction for the obtaining of that forgiuenesse. But wee will take them as they come, though by their owne grounds they be worth nothing, there being no satisfaction to be made by a man, as we shall see hereafter, so long as hee continueth in mortall sinne, and still continuing in it, vntill by forgiuenesse it bee blotted out. The Prophets denounce famine, sword, pestilence. *M. Perkins* should not haue made any question, but that they denounce them as the punishments of sinne, as fruits and effects of Gods curse according to the law. So did God accordingly execute them in furie and wrath, for iust reuengement vpon a rebellious and vnthankeful people. The point of question stood not in this, neither needed *M. Bishop* to bestow so much paines for the prouing of it. Yet it is to be obserued, that although God in generall denounced and executed the same by way of reuenge and punishment, yet in particular he had alwaies a respect to the calling & sauing of his elect, turning those common iudgements to bee vnto them occasions of repentance,

[a] *Tertul. adu. Marc. l. 4.*

pentance & turning vnto God to obtaine of him remiſſion of ſinnes and euerlaſting life. To them therefore vpon their repentance the nature of puniſhments was altered, and they became meanes either to receiue them preſently to endleſſe bliſſe, or to further them in the way wherein they were to walke for the attainement of it. Of this enough hath been ſaid already; but the matter heere is this, The Prophets denouncing ſuch plagues, doe withall call the people to repentance, to faſting, to praying, to putting on ſackecloth and aſhes. *This being performed*, ſaith *M. Biſhop, God was ſatisfied.* Therefore he will haue vs to vnderſtand, that the doing of theſe things was a ſatisfaction, that is, the paiment of a iuſt price vnto God, by which they merited the turning away of his feareful and heauy wrath. But this argument of his followeth not, becauſe we know, that a man in fauour may hold himſelfe ſatisfied towards another vpon his humbling of himſelfe, who yet receiueth not a ſatisfaction, that is, a iuſt and ſufficient recompence for the debt that is owing him, or the wrong that is done vnto him. The ſeruant that ought his maſter [b] *ten thouſand talents*, when he was called to paiment, fell downe at his Maſters feete, and beſought him for patience. His Maſter heerewith was appeaſed and ſatisfied, and forgaue him all the debt; and will any man heereupon ſay that he made his Maſter ſatisfaction for the debt? So is the caſe betwixt God and vs. Wee humble our ſelues before him, we praie, we intreat him to forgiue vs. He is herewith ſatisfied, that is, contented and appeaſed, and remitteth the treſpaſſe. Shall we now hereupon ſay, that our humbling of our ſelues, our intreaty and praier to forgiue vs, is the paiemnt of our debt? This is a mad concluſion as we take it, but ſuch pretty knots wil ſerue at Rome to tye the Popes trinkets together, and they hold faſt enough there, becauſe no man muſt meddle with the vntying of them. But this matter as Maiſter *Biſhop* handleth it, would require ſomewhat further to be conſidered of. We are therefore to vnderſtand, as in ſome part hath been ſignified before, that wee are to put difference betwixt outward and temporall forgiueneſſe, reſpecting only a temporall & earthly benefit, and that inward and ſpirituall forgiueneſſe, which ſerueth for the acquitting of the conſcience, to the obtaining of eternall life. That outward and temporall forgiueneſſe, is not indeede to be called a forgiueneſſe of the ſinne, but onely a forbearing

[b] Matth. 18. 24.

ring of the punishment. And this forbearance God yeelded not onely to true and faithfull repentance, but also to the externall signes and tokens thereof, proceeding onely from worldly sorow, vpon feare of temporall plagues and punishments either imminent or incumbent. For we must know that God ordereth the administration and gouernment of the world, not only for the bringing of his elect vnto eternall life, but so also as serueth for maintenance of publike order, and state, and societie amongst men. Such is the wickednesse of mans nature and proneneſſe to mischiefe and violence, to lasciuiousnesse and filthinesse, and all kinde of iniquitie, as that the state of men would grow intollerable, if God did not take course both to restraine men from that enormitie and excesse of sinne whereto nature tendeth, and to giue encouragement to those courses, which serue for the common good and benefit of mankinde. To which purpose *Cyprian* very rightly saith, [c] *If Gods censure and iudgement did not interpose it selfe amidst the doings of men, how great presumption would there be, growing secure and careles by the impunitie of sinne?* Now therefore when men grow to outrage & extremity, he sendeth amongst them his [d] *sore iudgemẽts, the sword, the famine, the pestilence*, which are [e] *as it were the lopping & pruning of mankind, when they grow too proud and ranke*, and hereby he redresseth the insolencies and disorders that are found amongst them. But when men vnderstanding the wrath and iudgement of God, do shew their dread and feare thereof, and yeeld themselues, though but ciuilly, to be reclaimed, he sheweth himselfe outwardly appeased and satisfied, and putteth vp the sword which he had drawne against them. Thus though the Niniuites were heathens & infidels, yet when vpon the preaching of *Ionas* they put on sackcloath and ashes, and shewed tokens of repentance, God did forbeare the destruction that hee had proclaimed against them. So when *Ahab* hearing by the message of *Elias* the fierce wrath of God conceiued against him, did shew himselfe moued thereat by [f] *rending his cloathes, and fasting, and lying in sackcloth*, though he were a most wicked man, yet the Lord somwhat relented from the sentence that he had denounced, and deferred the execution thereof from the father to the sons time. In like sort the people of Israell when they euery while by idolatrie departed from God, yet vpon humbling of themselues at the feeling of Gods heauy hand, found

c *Cypr. con. Demetr. Si non interederet rebus humanis diuina censura, quanta esset in hominibus audacia sacrinorum impunitate secura?*

d Ezech. 14. 21.

e *Tertul. de anima cap. 14. Reuera luxs & fames & bella, & e pro remedio deputanda, tanquam censura insolescent genera humani.*

f 1. King. 21. 27. 29.

mercy

mercy & deliuerance from the tyrany of their oppressours, though by the sequell it still appeareth, that they did it with a faithlesse and false heart. Thus God yeeldeth temporall benefit to outward discipline and conformity to his lawes, and sheweth his regard thereof for the course of this life, euen in them towards whom he hath no purpose of euerlasting life. Now although towards infidels and hypocrites vpon outward submission, God shew himselfe outwardly satisfied and contented, and do yeeld thereto the remitting of temporall punishments, yet *M. Bishop* will not hereupon conclude, that they haue made a satisfaction to God for their sinnes, because they themselues teach, that no man liuing in mortall sinne of impenitencie or infidelity, can performe any worke of satisfaction vnto God. So he himselfe here telleth vs, *that all satisfaction hath his vertue from the grace of God dwelling in vs, which is giuen vs for Christes sake*; whereupon it followeth, that where the grace of God dwelleth not by the faith of Christ, there can be no vertue of satisfaction in any thing that is done. The more vnshamefast man he, within foure lines after to bring the Niniuites for the proofe of their satisfaction, of whom he himselfe saith, that *it is not certaine that they had any expresse knowledge of the Messias* (he should haue said, it is certaine that they had none) *and therefore were farre enough off from laying hold on his satisfaction*, and consequently were farre off from the participation of the grace of God. But all is one with him; it carieth a shew, and that serueth his turne, making no conscience at all of abusing the ignorance or vnaduisednesse of his Reader, and onely regarding to vphold a side. But now as touching spirituall forgiuenesse of sinnes, for the acquitting of the conscience inwardly to God, all that mourne and weepe, that rend their clothes and lye in sackcloth and ashes, that is, that performe outward tokens of repentance, are not partakers thereof. The reason whereof is, because these workes of themselues do spiritually yeeld no satisfaction or contentment vnto God. Then do they obtaine true forgiuenesse and remission of sinnes, when they are vsed only as affections, wherewith we plead to the throne of the mercie of God the satisfaction of Iesus Christ, that not for the things which we do, but for his sake, and [g] *in him*, according to his promise he may be *well pleased* towards vs. In his name, not in our owne we come vnto God; for his merits, not for owne we begge of him to be mercifull vnto

[g] Mat. 3. 17.

vs;

vs; testifying by our repentance the feeling and greeuance of our wounds, but professing to expect in him onely the medicine for the cure. Neither do we herein begge the point in question, as *M. Bishop* alledgeth: but we giue him plaine and currant answer. We denie that which they affirme, that workes of pennance are true satisfactions to God for sinne. They seeke to proue it, for that God vpon the doing hereof is appeased, and forgiueth sinnes. We answer, that where God vpon the doing hereof, giueth forgiuenes of sins, it is not for the works sake that is done, but for that the doer by faith seeketh and findeth the washing away thereof in the bloud of Iesus Christ, it being he only of whom we are taught, that *h in him we haue redemption through his bloud, euen the forgiuenesse of our sins.* There are that do those works, and yet haue no forgiuenesse; and therefore that other in the doing thereof obtaine forgiuenesse, it is not to be attributed to the workes themselues, but to somwhat else that is respected therein. And what is all our repentance, but a bootelesse sorrow, a blinde horrour and anguish of minde, wherein there is nothing but darkenesse and feare, but onely as it receiueth light and comfort in the bloud of Christ, for the mitigating and aswaging of it? If it selfe for it selfe can giue no comfort, it is not satisfaction in it selfe: and therefore in all our repentance our satisfaction is in him onely, who as *S. Austine* saith, *i Paid that which was no debt of his, to free vs from our debt.* These things are spoken by due and iust course, and therefore *M. Bishop* must take here againe *the truants trickes*, in that he would with so bare a shift slip ouer a direct and formall answer.

h Col. 1. 14.

i *Aug. in Psal. 31. Soluit quod non debebat, ut nos à debito liberet.*

## R. W. BISHOP.

*Our first reason:* Daniel *giueth this counsaile to* Nabuchodonosor: Redeeme thy sinnes with almes, and thy offences with mercy on the poore. *If by such good deedes our sinnes may be redeemed, as holy writ doth testifie, then is followeth that such works yeald a sufficient satisfaction for them, for redemption signifieth a full contentment of the party offended, as well as satisfaction.*

Daniel. 4.

M. Perkins *answereth*, The skilfull in the Chaldey teach, that the word importeth rather a breaking off, then Redeeming.

Reply. *To. Authors in the aire, without pressing of the proprietie of*

*the*

*the word no answer can be giuen: but let vs admit that it be broken off; his sinne not being conscionsnesse, but pride and lacke of acknowledging al kingdoms to depend vpon God, as the text it selfe doth specifie, To breake off this sinne by almes, and compassion of the poore, is nothing else but by such works of charity, in some sort to satisfie Gods iustice, thereby to mone him to take compassion of him. And that by almes deedes we are clensed from our sinnes, our Sauiour himselfe doth teach, saying:* Giue almes, and behold all things are cleane vnto you.

Luke.11.

R. ABBOT.

This obiection serueth much for the clearing of that that hath bene said in the former section, and to open a way to the true vnderstāding of many phrases, which by the Papists are abused to the maintenance of their absurd position of humane satisfaction. We are to consider, what the person is to whom they are spoken, and in what respect the Prophet spake them. *Nabuchodonosor* was a heathen King, voide of the grace and spirit of God, hauing no knowledge, nor yeelding any acknowledgment of God, but wrapt God by miracle wrested from him, and yet thencefoorth drowning that also in pride, oppression, cruelty, tyrannie, and all kinde of iniquitie & iniustice. Now therfore by the doctrine of the Romish Schoole, he was not in case to do any worke of satisfaction. For *M. Bishop* telleth vs, as we haue seene before, that *all satisfaction hath his vertue from the grace of God*, and *Thomas Aquinas* saith, that *a* *works done without charity, haue no power of satisfaction*, & therefore where grace and charity are not, no satisfaction can be done. If then *Nabuchodonosor*, were not capable in their meaning, to do a worke of satisfaction, how impudently do they deal, to alledge that that was said to him to the maintenance of their doctrine of satisfactions? How should he be aduised according to their meaning to *redeeme* his sinnes, from whom by their own rules nothing could proceed that might in their meaning bee a redemption for his sins? Againe, here is nothing intended as touching the true forgiuenesse of sins, wherein consisteth the spiritual reconcilement of man to God, but onely as touching the auoiding of a threatned outward iudgment, and the preseruation of temporal & earthly state, which God yeeldeth

a Thom. Aquin. suppl. q. 14. art. 2. in corp. Sine charitate opera facta non sunt satisfactoria.

derh euen to ciuill and morall change of former euill courses, as before was said. *Daniel* had threatned vnto him from God the losse of his vnderstanding, and the casting of him forth to the company of bruit beasts. He aduiseth him yet to alter his former doings, by which he had drawne that sentence vpon himselfe, to trie whether haply God would bee moued thereby to reuoke the iudgement which he had pronounced. [b] *Wilt thou*, saith hee, as *Theodoret* resolueth the speech, *receiue the fruit of mercy? shew the same then to them who haue obtained the like condition of nature with thy selfe, for so thou maist perswade the iudge to put away his threatnings, and not to suffer them to be brought to effect.* Where *Hierom* conceiueth that [c] *Nabuchodonosor according to* Daniels *counsell, did shew mercy to the poore, and therefore for twelue moneths the sentence was deferred, vntil vpon glorying in his Babel, by sinne of pride he lost the benefit of mercy.* So then we see the forbearing of the punishment graunted to a meer outward reformation, and yet the King being an infidel, there was no remission of the sinne. There could therfore bee no satisfaction, because satisfaction cannot be without remission; whereof it followeth, that sith *Daniels* words had their effect without any satisfaction, therefore there can no satisfaction be concluded thereof. For further confirmation hereof, wee are to note what *Origen* saith as touching this matter, who obseruing, that [d] *of good works there is one sort which we do for men or according to men; another which we do for God or according to God*, for example thereof saith: *A man doth good being moued by naturall iustice, and not in respect of God, euen as heathens many times did and many men do. This worke*, saith he, *is but common oile, and of no great sauor, and yet it is acceptable with God, as* Daniel *signifieth, saying to a King that knew not God, Heare my counsel, O King, and redeeme thy sinnes with almes. Some such matter* Peter *also saith in* Clement, *that the good works which are done by infidels, do benefit them in this world, but not in the world to come, for the obtaining of eternall life; and that very rightly, because they do them not for Gods sake, but onely as of the nature of man. But they which doe these things in respect of God, that is the faithfull, haue benefit thereby, not*

b *Theod in Dan. 4 Vis clementiæ fructũ percipere? Hanc eandẽ erga eos ostendito qui vnam tecũ sortiti sunt naturam: ita enim iudici persuadere poteris vt minas extinguat neque sinat eas ad exitum perduci.*

c *Hieron in Dan. 4 Fecit iuxta Danielis consilium misericordias in pauperes, & ideirco vsque ad mensẽ duodecimum in eum dilata est sententia. Sed quia posses ambulans in aula Babylonis gloriatur, &c. bonum misericordiæ perdidit malo superbiæ.*

d *Origen. in Mat. tract. 35. Operis boni aliud est quod facimus propter homines vel secũdum hominẽ: aliud autem quod propter Deum vel secundum Deum &c. Vt puta benè quis facit hominibus naturali iustitiæ motus non propter Deũ, quamuis faciebant in eũ & gentes & multi faciunt hominibus. Opus illud dicitur esse vulgare, non magni odoris, & tamen acceptabile apud Deum, sicut Daniel significat dicens ad Baltasar Deum non cognoscentem, Audi &c. Tale aliquid dicit & Petrus apud Clementem, quoniam opera bona quæ fiunt ab infidelibus in hoc seculo eis prosunt, non & in illo ad consequendam vitã æternam. Et conuenienter: quia nec illi propter Deũ faciunt, sed propter naturã humanam. Qui autem propter Deum faciunt id est fidele, non solum in hoc seculo proficit eis, sed in illo magis autem in illo.*

onely

*onely in this world, but also in that, yea specially in that that is to come.* Here is the true condition of *Nabuchodonosors* works set forth vnto vs; he was an infidell, he knew not God; that which he did, hee did it onely by natural instinct; God respected it no further but only for this world, and only in that respect did *Daniel* say vnto him *Redeeme thy sinnes with almes*, and therefore it must needes be granted, that the word of *redeeming* is very vnproperly vsed, & can haue no such meaning as *M. Bishop* intendeth by it. Now therfore albeit it be true which *M. Perkins* obserueth out of the learned in the Chaldee tongue, that the word which is by the vulgar interpreter translated to *redeeme*, doth properly signifie *to break off*, yet he needed not to haue rested vpon that answer, but should rather haue taken the common translation, thereby to euict that the name of *redemption* hath vse with ecclesiasticall writers, without any intendment of Popish satisfaction. For words are not alwaies to be racked to their natiue and proper vse, but from it are borrowed many times to import somewhat else which in some respect may seeme neere vnto it. *Redemption* properly importeth the paiment of a iust price, for the setting of a captiue or bondmã free. In this meaning it is vsed of our Sauiour Christ, who gaue himselfe for a price for vs, to set vs free from death and sinne, & to reconcile vs vnto God; but in this meaning to attribute vnto our selues any power or worth to pay any price, or to yeeld any valuable recompence vnto God for our sinnes, is a blasphemy intollerable, and a great impeachment of the sufficiencie of Christs redemption. Yet notwithstanding the terme of *redeeming* is otherwise many times vsed, when one thing is made consequent to the doing or forgoing of another, as the freedome of the bondman is to the paiment of the price. In this case the one is said to be *redeemed* by the other, not because it is a worthy price for the purchase, but because it is an opportunity for the obtaining or gaining of it. Thus *Nabuchodonosor* formerly said to his soothsaiers: [e] *I know certainly that ye redeem the time*, that is, that ye vse your talke for the prolonging of the time. So are we said by forgoing the vanities and pleasures of the world, [f] *to redeeme the time*, because thereby we take the opportunity thereof to bestow it to the Lords vse. Thus the heathen King was willed by almes-deedes to *redeeme* his sinnes, not, as though his almes-deeds were any satisfaction to God for his sinnes, which by the

e Dan. 2. 8.

f Ephe. 5. 16. Col. 4. 5.

doctrine

doctrine of Popery could not bee, but becauſe God for the common benefit of mankinde, hath vouchſafed to yeeld good for the onely outward forſaking of euill waies, howſoeuer inward regeneration finde no place at all. Thus a man is ſaid with his goods to redeeme his ſoule, not for that worldly goods are a price for the ſauing of a ſoule, God forbid; but for that by forgoing his goods, he findeth meanes and opportunity of being ſaued by Ieſus Chriſt. And in this ſort eccleſiaſticall writers are wont ſometimes to attribute to works of repentance and charity the redemption of our ſinnes, not for that they tooke them in themſelues to be any price, for the worth whereof God ſhould bee appeaſed towards vs, but onely becauſe to the faithfull doers thereof for Chriſts ſake, in whoſe name they are done, God hath made the promiſe of forgiueneſſe of ſinnes and euerlaſting life. Now by that that hath bene ſaid, we ſee that *M. Biſhops* argument is fallen into this frame, *Nabuchodonoſor* an infidell and heathen king, neuer partaker of forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, and not capable by the doctrine of the Church of Rome of doing any ſatisfaction for ſinne, is willed to *redeeme his ſinnes with almes deeds*; therefore after forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, there remaineth yet a ſatisfaction to be made for the ſinnes that are forgiuen. He that ſhall denie his argument, ſhall doe him a ſhrewd turne; for how to proue it, hee cannot tell. As for the place which he citeth out of *S. Luke*, it muſt import ſomwhat further thē the words ſound. For infidels as we haue ſeene of *Nabuchodonoſor* do giue almes, and yet all things are not cleane vnto them, for [g] *to vnbeleeuers nothing is cleane, but euen their minds and conſciences are defiled.* The Phariſees alſo to whom Chriſt there ſpeaketh, [h] gaue almes, and yet they were not cleanſed thereby. Yea the Apoſtle S. *Paul* giueth vs to vnderſtand, that [i] a man may *giue all his goods to feede the poore*, and yet being without charity and loue, *it profiteth him nothing.* But by the occaſion of the words, the meaning of them will appeare. He hath ſaid before, [k] *Indeede ye Phariſes make clean the outſide of the cup and of the platter, but* * *that which is within you, is full of rauening and wickedneſſe.* Hereupon he addeth for reproofe; *Ye fooles, did not he that made that which is without, make that which is within alſo?* Then for correction and exhortation he bringeth in the words which *M. Biſhop* alledgeth by halues; * *Yea, rather giue for alms thoſe things that are within, & behold all things ſhal*

g Tit.1.15.
h Math.6.2.
i 11.Cor.13.3.
k Luk.11.39.
* τὰ ἐνόντα ὑμῶν.
* πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην.

*be cleane vnto you.* Where presuppoſing as wee may conceiue that they did giue almes, or otherwiſe exhorting them ſo to do, hee withall directeth the true manner of the giuing thereof, conſiſting not onely in reaching a gift with the hand, but in giuing the heart and affection, and [l] *powring out the ſoule,* as the Prophet ſpeaketh, *to the hungry*; in ſhewing *iudgement, and mercy, and fidelity* to our brethren, for the want whereof hee taketh exception againſt them in the next words, as Saint *Mathew* expreſſeth the particulars thereof. Therefore he admoniſheth them by theſe words, that as they were carefull outwardly to cleanſe their cups and platters, ſo they ſhould much more be carefull to cleanſe their hearts, to voide themſelues of hypocriſie, couetouſneſſe, briberie, crueltie, and to put on charity, compaſſion, mercy, iuſtice, and faithfulneſſe, and then not onely their diſhes and veſſels, but their almes-deeds, their meates and drinkes now defiled with rapine and couetouſneſſe, yea *all things ſhould be cleane vnto them.* It is not for almes then that Chriſt ſaith, *Behold all things ſhall be cleane vnto you*, for almes it ſelfe may be defiled and vncleane, but for [n] *loue out of a pure hart, & a good conſcience, and faith vnfained.* So that in effect the words of Chriſt are but the ſame with that which the Apoſtle ſaith, [o] *All things are cleane to them that are cleane*, that is, to them who in hart and conſcience are purified and cleanſed. And becauſe [p] *by faith the heart is purified*, therfore he ſaith in effect, *to them that beleeue all things are cleane.* So then *Maiſter Biſhop* reaſoneth thus, To them that giue almes in true faith and a good conſcience, all things are cleane; therefore by almes deeds wee are redeemed and purged from our ſinnes. We denie the argument, becauſe it is not by almes it ſelfe that all things are cleane vnto vs, but almes it ſelfe receiueth purity and cleanneſſe from faith and a good conſcience, without which it is in Gods ſight defiled and vncleane.

l Iſa. 58.10.

m Math. 23.25.

n 1. Tim. 1.5.

o Tit. 1.15.

p Acts 15.9.

## 13. W. Biſhop.

*Our fict.* Bring forth the worthy fruits of penance. *That is, doe ſuch workes as become them who are penitent: Which* (*as* S. Chryſoſtome *expoundeth*) *are:* Hee that hath ſtollen away another mans goods, let him now giue of his owne: he that hath committed fornication, let him abſtaine from the lawfull company of his owne wife,

Math. 3. Luke 3. Hom. 10. in Math.

wise, and so forth: *recompencing the workes of sinne, with the contrary workes of vertue. The same exposition giueth Saint* Gregorie, *and to omit all others, venerable* Bede *interpreteth them thus.* Mortifie your sinnes by doing the worthy fruites of penance, to wit, by afflicting your selues so much for euery offence, as worthy penance doth require, which will be a sacrifice of iustice, that is, a most iust sacrifice. Hom. 10. in E. uang. in Psal. 5.

*To this* M Perkins *answereth, that this texts is absurd, for the word repent, signifyeth, onely change your minds from sinne to God, & testifie it by good workes.*

Reply. *His answer is most absurd, for wee argue out of these words* (Worthy fruits of penance:) *and hee answereth to the word going before, repent: which we vse not against them; and for his glose or testifying our repentance, is sufficiently confuted by the Fathers before alledged.*

*And Saint* Iohn *expresly maketh them the meanes to escape the wrath of God, saying, that the Axe was set to the Roote of the Tree, and vnlesse by worthy fruits of penance they appeased God, they should be cut vp, and cast into hell fire: and seemeth to confute the laying hold on Christs satisfaction by faith: saying, it will not helpe you to say that yee are the Sonnes of* Abraham, *who was father of all true beleeuers: as much as if he had said, Trust not to your faith, hand off ye generation of vipers. For notwithstanding ye bee the sonnes of the faithfull, vnlesse ye amend your liues, and for the euill works which ye haue done heeretofore, make recompēce, and satisfie the iustice of God with good, ye shall be cast into hell fire.*

## R. Abbot.

This argument is like his fellowes that are gone before. *Wee must doe such workes as become those that are penitent,* therefore the works that we do are satisfactions for our sinnes. A man would thinke that Master *Bishop* should haue more discretion, then to bring such light stuffe in so waighty a cause. Though Master *Perkins* had alledged it out of some of their bookes, yet reason would haue required, that hee in the reuiew should haue better aduised of it. But we see, *Trigge* and *Trugge* will not part companie; what his fellowes haue said, bee it good or bad, true or

falſe, he will ſay it to the death. Onely his memory faileth him a little, where he ſaith, that they *vſe no argument againſt vs from the words going before, Do penance*, as they ſay; *Repent*, as we trãſlate it; hauing forgotten that his maſters of [a] Rhemes made a ſtout argument from thence in behalfe of penance and ſatisfaction. Very impudently they dealt therein, becauſe it is contrary to their owne doctrine, to vrge penance and ſatisfaction vpon them that are to be baptized, and *Thomas Aquinas* affirmeth it to be an iniury to the bloud of Chriſt, as I haue [b] before ſhewed; and therefore by their owne doctrine, the words of *Iohn Baptiſt* cannot be vnderſtood of any ſuch matter. But yet they were faine for a ſhift to take hold of that, becauſe they had nothing elſe ſo colourably to ſerue turne in that behalfe. It was out of *M. Biſhops* head what they had ſaid, or elſe without doubt he would haue ſaid the like. But *M. Perkins* hath rightly told him, that the Greeke word μετανοεῖν there vſed by *S. Iohn*, ſignifieth the alteration and change of the mind from ſin to righteouſneſſe. It importeth no acts of penance, but inward reforming of our affections for the amendment of our liues. And therefore doth *Athanaſius* ſay that *repentance* hath it name from thence, [c] *for that it transferreth or remoueth the mind from euill to good. M. Biſhop* will not ſtand vpon this; he vrgeth the other words, *worthy fruits of penance.* Howſoeuer he tranſlate them abſurdly, yet wee approue his expoſition of them, *do ſuch works as become them that are penitent*; but what followeth hereof for him? Surely wee teach men to do ſuch works as become them that profeſſe repentance, to recompence former works of ſinne with contrary works of vertue; former neglect and careleſneſſe, with due circumſpection and watchfulneſſe ouer their waies and conuerſation. Wee teach that in grieuous ſins our griefe and affliction of mind ſhould be the more, and that both inwardly it is ſo, and outwardly appeareth ſo to bee, where true repentance is, euen as greater wounds cauſe greater feeling and paine, and make men more earneſt to ſeeke remedy and cure. But in all this we can find no ſatisfaction, in all this wee cannot finde that our affliction and ſorrow is the thing it ſelfe that workes the cure. It is the humbling of our ſelues to ſeeke mercy at Gods hands, for the waſhing away of our ſinnes in the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt, but we know not how it ſelfe ſhould bee taken for a water to waſh vs from our ſinnes. But yet

*M. Biſhop*

[a] *Rhem. Teſtam. Annot. Math. 3. 2.*

[b] of Iuſtification. Sect. 10.

[c] *Athanaſ. quæſt. 102. Ideò pœnitẽtia reſipiſcẽtia dicitur quod mentẽ à malo in bonum tranſferat.*

*M. Bishop* will proue it so to be, because *Iohn Baptist* saith, [d] *Now is the axe laid to the roote of the tree: euery tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruite shall be hewne downe and cast into the fire.* Which is euen as much to the purpose, as if he had said iust nothing. We say also that euery tree that bringeth not forth good fruite, shall be hewne downe and cast into the fire, but still we say, what is this to satisfaction? We still require his proofe, that for the vertue and woorth of these fruites it is that God is appeased towards vs. But that cannot be; for a man cannot bring forth good fruite, except first of all he be made a good tree; for [e] *an euill tree cannot bring forth good fruite.* And if he must first be a good tree that he may bring forth good fruite, then God must first be appeased towards him, which is by the faith of Iesus Christ, [f] *whom God hath set forth to be our reconciliation or attonement through faith in this bloud.* Our good fruites then are not the causes, but the effects of Gods being appeased towards vs. If we haue none, we are sure that we are in state of iudgement and damnation; and the sentence of Saint *Iohn* taketh hold of vs; but if we haue them, we are not to account them the redemption of our sinnes, but testimonies of the remission and forgiuenesse thereof. Yea but Saint *Iohn*, saith *M. Bishop*, *seemeth to confute the laying hold on Christes satisfaction by faith.* Where, or in what words? Marry because he saith, *Say not in your hearts, we haue* Abraham *to our father.* We may imagine that he had a vizard on his face whē he wrote this, that the paper might not see him blush. Why, what is there in these wordes against the laying hold on Christs satisfactiō by faith? Forsooth he saith to them, *it will not helpe you to say that ye are the sonnes of Abraham, who was father of all true beleeuers.* Well, but what is this yet to laying hold on Christs satisfaction by faith? *It is as much*, saith he, *as if he had said, trust not to your faith; hand off ye generation of vipers.* This is a strange construction, that *say not in your hearts, we haue* Abraham *to our Father*, should be as much as to say, *Trust not to your faith.* But it grew at Rome, and we know that things farre fetched are woont to be very strange. As for vs, we conceiue in our simplicity that *Iohns* meaning was to reproue them for flattering themselues, for that carnally they were the seede of *Abraham*, as if that were sufficient security for them towards God, when as in the meane time they neglected the repentance, and faith, and workes of

d Ver. 10.

e Chap. 7. 17.

f Rom. 3. 25.

g Rom. 4. 12. h Iohn. 8. 39. *Abraham.* The true children of *Abraham* are they g *who walke in the steps of the faith of Abraham*, and h *do the workes of Abraham*, which they not regarding, could not be accounted the sonnes of *Abraham*, whose of-spring was reckoned according to the spirit, not according to the flesh. Thus doth our Sauiour testifie of them that they beleeued not; saying vnto them: i *Publicans and harlots shall go before you into the Kingdome of God: For* Iohn *came vnto you in the way of righteousnesse, and ye beleeued him not, but Publicans and harlots beleeued him; and ye, though ye saw it, were not moued with repentance afterward that ye might beleeue him.* Now is it not a wonder, that whereas it is apparent that they had no faith, yet *Iohn Baptist* should say vnto them, *Trust not to your faith*? Well, all this is nothing, he cannot serue the Popes turne that will not notably cogge and lye. The rest of his commentarie accordeth with this, where he foisteth in *the satisfying of Gods iustice*, there being nothing in the words of S. *Iohn*, that soundeth to that effect.

i Math. 21. 31.

## 14. W. Bishop.

Cor. 7. 10. *The 7. obiection with* M. Perkins. *Paul* setteth downe sundrie fruites of repentance, whereof one is reuenge, whereby repentant persons punish themselues to satisfie Gods iustice, for the temporall punishment of their sinnes.

*M. Perkins answereth.* A repentant sinner must take vengeance of himselfe, and that is, to vse all meanes to subdue the corruption of nature, & to bridel carnal affection, which kind of affections are restrainments properly, but no punishments; directed against the sinne, but not against the person.

Reply. *I neuer saw any writer so contradict himselfe, and so dull, that he doth not vnderstand his owne words. If this subduing of our corrupt nature be restrainements only from sinne hereafter, and not also punishments of sin past, how then doth the repentant sinner take vengeance of himselfe, which you affirme that he must do? Reuenge as euery simple body knoweth, is the requit all of euill past: We graunt that all satisfaction is directed against sinne, and not against the person, but for the great good of the man, albeit that for a season it may afflict, both his bodie and mind too, as Saint* Pauls *former Epistle did the Corinthians, but this sorrow being according vnto God, doth much benefit the person, as the Apostle declareth. For besides this reuenge taken on himselfe to*

*appease*

*appease Gods wrath, it breedeth (as it is in the text following) in our corrupt nature that loueth not such chastisement,* A feare to returne to sinne, *least it be againe punished for where there is no feare of paines, & much pleasure, thither our corruption will runne headlong. It stirreth vp also in vs,* Indignation against sinne, *& all the wicked instruments of it,* A defence and clearing of ourselues, *with the honester sort.* And an emulation, *and desire to flie as farre from sinne as other our equals, and consequently* A loue of vertue and honest life, *which freeth vs frõ that sorrow and all other troublesome passions, all which are plainly gathered out of the same text of S.* Paul.

R. Abbot.

The Greeke fathers *Chrysostome Theophylact, Oecumenius,* and *Hierome* amongst the Latines, do referre *the reuenge* there spoken of by the Apostle to the punishment of the incestuous man, whereby they maintained the authority and due regard of the lawes of God But we further very willingly yeeld, that by *reuenge* is also meant a wreaking of a mans anger, as I may terme it, vpon himselfe; being offended and grieued at himselfe for the sinne that he hath done, and therefore bending himselfe to crosse and thwart those desires by which he was led vnto it. This the Scripture teacheth vs by the termes of [a] *denying our selues,* [b] *mortifying our earthly members,* [c] *suffering in the flesh,* [d] *crucifying the flesh with the affections and lusts of it,* and [e] *destroying of the body of sinne.* Thus men occasion requiring, giue themselues ouer to fasting, and weeping, and mourning, and forbearing of accustomed delights, yea and to open rebuke and shame with men, hauing by publik offence made themselues a scandall to the church. This *reuenge* we denie not; we say that hereby we testifie both to God and men the displeasure and offence that we haue taken against our selues; we teach others to take heed, and carefully to shun those occasions wherby we haue fallen; we labour hereby that the tẽptations of sin may no more in the like sort preuaile against vs; but we are still to seeke of that vse which *M. Bishop* maketh of it, that this anger of ours against our selues is a price of satisfaction for the appeasing of Gods anger. To this being the very point, he saith neuer a word; he telleth vs of *reuenge,* but he proueth not that this reuenge is a matter of

a Math. 16. 24.
b Col. 3. 5.
c 1. Pet. 4. 1.
d Gal 5. 24.
e Rom. 6. 6.

ſatisfactiō. We ſay that to this *reuenge* of true & faithfull repentance God granteth remiſſion of ſinnes, but we ſay he granteth it, becauſe we ſeeke it, not in the merit of our reuenge, but onely in the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt.

15. W. BISHOP.

*Laſtly ſaith* M. Perkins: They make three workes of ſatisfaction, Praier, Faſting, and Almes-deedes.

For the firſt, it is meere fooliſhnes to think, that a man by praier can ſatisfie for his ſins, it is all one as if you had ſaid, that a begger by asking an almes can deſerue the almes, or a debtor by requeſting his creditor to pardon his debt, ſhould thereby pay his debt.

*That Praier doth appeaſe Gods iuſtice, and obtaine pardon, God himſelfe is witneſſe, ſaying:* Call vpon me in the day of tribulation, & I
Pſal.49. will deliuer thee. *Praier cannot be made without faith in Gods power, and hope in his goodneſſe, and therefore muſt needs be pleaſing in Gods ſight: by praier we humble our ſelues before God, and acknowledge his omnipotencie, and our infirmity. By praier we lament with bitter teares our owne ingratitude, folly, and wickednes, & bewaile the grieuouſnes of our ſinnes: ſuch praier made King* Dauid (*as his Pſalmes do teſtifie*) *water his couch with teares, making them his foode day and night: and*
2 Paral.33. *by them he ſatisfied for his former offences. So did a farre greater ſinner then he, King* Manaſſes: *who falling into tribulation,* prayed vnto the Lord his God, & did great penance before the God of his fathers, and prayed, and intreated earneſtly, and God heard his prayers, & brought him back againe to Ieruſalem into his Kingdome. *Now to* M. Perkins Similes. *A begger doth not deſerue his almes, becauſe he makes not this former kind of prayer, but the ſhort ſleight one of the Proteſtants from the lips outward. The like we ſay of a debter, whoſe creditor being a needy man, will not be paid without mony, but God who needs non of our goods, highly eſteemeth of an humble & contrite heart, grieued much for hauing ſinned in the ſight of God, and humbly ſuing vnto*
Matth.18. *him for pardon. To ſuch a one he ſaid*: did I not forgiue thee all thy debts, becauſe thou beſoughteſt me?

R. ABBOT.

Maſter *Biſhops* arguments are like the foxes whelpes, neuer a one better then other and all ſtarke naught. It is ſtrange to ſee what

what ſhuffling and ſhifting he vſeth to make ſome good ſhew of a bad cauſe. The queſtion is, whether prayer be a worke of ſatisfaction, that is, a worke of that woorth and price, as that by the merit thereof we make God a iuſt and ſufficient recompence for the offence that we haue done. For the proofe hereof he alledgeth the ſentence of the Pſalme; *Call vpon me in the time of trouble, and I will heare thee.* So then his reaſon is this, God hath promiſed to heare vs when we pray vnto him, therefore prayer is a worke of ſatisfaction. As much as if he ſhould ſay, the prince promiſeth a traitour vpon his ſubmiſſion and intreatie to giue him his pardon: therefore his ſubmiſſion and intreaty is a ſufficient recompence for his treaſon. We may ſee how maruellouſly the Romaine religion ſharpeneth mens eye-ſight, that they can ſee mans ſatisfaction there, where God onely ſignifieth his owne mercifull diſpoſition. Yea but *God doth thereby witneſſe, that prayer doth appeaſe Gods iuſtice and obtaine pardon.* Yea but what need a pardon when the ſin is already pardoned? for prayer is made a worke of ſatisfaction after the forgiueneſſe of the ſinne, as I haue ſhewed before. A very ridiculous deuice, that God firſt remitteth the treſpaſſe, and we afterwards for a puniſhment, and to make God amends and ſatisfaction, muſt ſay, Forgiue vs our treſpaſſes. Therefore when he ſpeaketh of *obtaining pardon*, he doth but ſeeke by words of truth to colour abſurd dotages of falſhood and error. The vſe of prayer is indeed not to make ſatisfaction, but to craue pardon. It appeaſeth Gods iuſtice by the intreating of his mercy, whileſt we beſeech him to heare vs, not for our prayers ſake, but for Chriſts ſake; not by the merit of our ſatisfaction, but by vertue of his interceſſion; not for the works ſake which we do, but for his truths ſake, for that he hath promiſed ſo to do to them that call vpon him. By our prayer we requeſt him to forgiue vs, that is, not to vrge vs to ſatisfaction, and is it not an abſurd fancy to affirme prayer it ſelfe to be a ſatisfaction? And what do men in this caſe, but mock and dally with God, in asking him forgiueneſſe, when in the meane time they thinke to make him a full and iuſt requitall of his wrongs, ſo that there ſhall be nothing to be forgiuen? For what remaineth to be forgiuen where there is yeelded a ſufficient recompence for the offence done? *M. Biſhop* goeth on and telleth vs, that *prayer cannot be made without faith.* It is true, & by faith it is that our prayer obtaineth all things at Gods hand.

a Pſal. 50. 15.

b *Ambroſ. de Pœnitent. lib. 2. cap. 8. tanquam ex ſyngrapha fides impetrat, nõ tanquam ex debito.*

hand. But of faith it is true which *S. Ambroſe* ſaith, that[b] *it obtaineth as by deed of gift, not by way of debt.* It looketh not to our ſatisfaction, but to the promiſe of God through the mediation of Ieſus Chriſt. Further he allegeth idlely and impertinently, that praier is *pleaſing vnto God: that by it we humble our ſelues before him, acknowledging his omnipotencie, and our owne infirmity*; that *thereby wee lament and bewaile the grieuouſneſſe of our ſinnes.* He mentioneth *King Dauid watering his couch with teares, and making them his foode day & night:* & *Manaſſes greatly humbling himſelfe*, as the text ſaith, (*not doing great penãce* as he tranſlateth) & *intreating the Lord*, ſo as *that the Lord heard him, &c.* Now all theſe things are according to the Prouerbe, *Proraſtris ligones; we call for rakes, & he ſends vs mattocks*; we demand one thing, and he anſwereth another. We ſay that prayer is pleaſing to God; we confeſſe all theſe vſes and effects thereof, but what is all this to the prooving of ſatisfaction? how doth hee make it appeare that that which *Dauid* and *Manaſſes* did, they did it with opinion or purpoſe to make ſatisfaction for their ſinnes? I would aske him here with what face hee could thus ſet himſelfe to delude his Reader with empty ſhadowes and ſhewes of vaine diſcourſe, but that I ſee his whole booke in a manner is made of ſuch deluſions. But here to ſhew the abſurditie of this aſſertion of theirs, that praier is a matter of ſatisfaction, *M. Perkins* had ſaid, that *it is all one as if they ſhould ſay, that a begger by asking of almes ſhould deſerue his almes, or that a debter by requeſting his creditor to pardon the debt, ſhould thereby pay the debt.* See now what a ſchollerlike anſwer *M. Biſhop* hath returned. To the firſt he ſaith, *A begger doth not deſerue his almes, becauſe he makes not this former kind of praier but the ſhort ſleight one of the Proteſtants from the lippes outward.* Thus full ſimply he giueth a gird at the Proteſtants prayers, to ſhift himſelfe from anſwering for their owne. But what if the begger do make that kind of prayer, and with much lamentation craue an almes, is he thereby to expect it as deſerued and due vnto him? hath he hereby any iuſt right and title to that which he craueth? Surely, if it be due vnto him, it is no almes, or if it be an almes, then it is not due vnto him. Why could not *Maſter Biſhop* conceiue the inſtance as well of the earneſt and hearty requeſt of the begger, as of that ſhort ſleight one from the lips outward, but that he

was

was put to his shifts, and was glad thus in a cloud to steale away? But it is some further matter that he hath respect vnto. For we Protestants are content to pray simply as Christ hath taught, not thinking any vertue to consist [c] *in multitude of words*, nor imagining that by the length of our prayers we are to preuaile with God, or that by the often saying of them he is the more affected with them, but measuring prayer by the intention and affection of the heart, vttering it selfe according to the motion of it selfe, either by few or many words. We pray not by rule, nor offer our deuotions to God by task and tale, knowing it to be but [d] *babling to moue a necessary matter to God with superfluous and needlesse words*. But the new Catholikes are like the old heathens, who thought themselues to be the better [e] *heard for their much babling and often repeating*, and therefore they say their praiers by number and stint, as if they would make therof a charme of inchantment to bind God to their will. A man for a penance must say so many Pater nosters, and so many Auemaries, and so many Creedes, and when he hath so done, he is man good enough, he hath made satisfaction for his sinnes. In one of their bookes there are seuen short prayers before which there is this Rubricke: [f] *Whosoeuer being in the state of grace, shall deuoutly say these seuen prayers following before the Crucifixe, with seuen Pater nosters, and seuen Auemaries, he shall obtaine sixe & fifty thousand yeares of pardon; fourteene thousand granted by Saint Gregorie, fourtene thousand by Nicholas the fifth, and those doubled by Sixtus the fourth.* O what a horrible vertue there is in the number of *Seuen*, when it comes to prayers and pater nosters, and Auemaries, what a foule rule would he make in Purgatorie, that should vse euery day to say these prayers? He should haue so many thousand yeares to spare from himselfe as that he might rid a great murth of soules out of that cruell prison. Such a like foolerie do we finde in their [g] *Iesus Psalter*, commended for that *the glorious name of Iesus is therein called vpon foure hundred and fifrie times*: in which *there are fifteene principall petitions, which must be said euery one by themselues ten times, and you may say them vpon your tenne fingers*, (to be sure to keepe iust reckoning) *or else vpon tenne beades*, and in euery of these tenne times the name of Iesus is thrice repeated, thirty times in euery petition, as for example:

c Eccles. 5.2.

d *August. Epist. 121. cap. 10. Multum loqui est rem necessariam superfluis agere verbis.*

e Math. 6.7.

f *Horæ beatæ Mar. Virg. secundum vsum Sarum. Quicunque in statu gratiæ ex sens deuo & dixerit septem orationes sequentes, cum 7. Pater noster, & 7. Aue Marie ante imaginem pietatis, merebitur 36 millia annorum inualgent &c.*

g Jesus Psalter in the end of the Manual of meditation, &c.

I. *Iesu*,

1 *Ieſu, Ieſu, Ieſu, mercie.*
2 *Ieſu, Ieſu, Ieſu, mercy.*
3 *Ieſu, Ieſu, Ieſu, mercy. &c.*

The ſecond petition.

1 *Ieſu, Ieſu, Ieſu, helpe me.*
2 *Ieſu, Ieſu, Ieſu, helpe me.*
3 *Ieſu, Ieſu, Ieſu, helpe me. &c.*

The third petition.

1 *Ieſu, Ieſu, Ieſu, ſtrength me.*
2 *Ieſu, Ieſu, Ieſu, ſtrength me.*
3 *Ieſu, Ieſu, Ieſu, ſtrength me, &c.* till in euery one ye make vp the number of ten. Now I trow the *ſhort ſleight prayers of the Proteſtants* be not comparable to theſe deuotions: no maruell if both heauen and hell be coniured at ſo often repeating of the name of Ieſus. What *Circe* might be thought likely to bewitch men ſo farre, as to giue any regard to ſuch drunken fancies? What Prophet, or Apoſtle, or Father, or Martyr, or Confeſſor hath giuen thē any example of praying in this ſort? Or if they haue no example of it, why do they thus leudly entangle ſimple ſoules with an opinion of deuotion in that wherein there is nothing but abſurd and heathenish ſuperſtition? Theſe now are the prayers of ſatisfaction, by which *M. Biſhop* will haue vs to vnderſtand, that there is a difference betwixt Catholikes and beggers; for Catholikes ſay their prayers often ouer, and thereby they merit much. And yet we ſee, that an importunate hungry begger will ſtand long, & go ouer his beggers dittie, as often as *M. Biſhops* pœnitent doth his Pater noſter and his Creed, who for all that, can claime nothing as due vnto him for the paines that he hath taken. And if a begger by his inſtance and erneſtneſſe can merit nothing at a mans hands, ſhall we thinke that a Catholike begger by his inſtance can merit and deſerue at the hands of God? Beleeue it that liſt: as for vs we know that prayer craueth by way of almes, and therefore by way of merit can expect nothing.

His exception to *M. Perkins* ſecond compariſon is as ridiculous and vaine as the former: *The like we ſay of a debter*, ſaith he, *whoſe creditor being a needy man will not be payed without money.* But what if the creditor be not a needy man, but will be content without any money

money to remit the debt? What are all creditours needy men, and are there none found that forgiue debts? doth *M. Bishop* know neuer a Catholike that sheweth so great compassion vpon a poore man, humbly intreating him in that behalfe? If he do not, wee suspect their charity: if he doe, wee suspect his honesty, who would mocke his Reader with such a paltry shift, telling vs an idle tale, what it is wherewith the creditor is payed, when our speech is of intreaty to remit the debt. But in this case it is cleere, that as it is absurd to say, that the debtors intreaty for the forgiuing of his debt may be called a satisfaction for the debt: so it is absurd to say, that our prayer to God for the forgiuenesse of our sinnes, may be called a satisfaction for our sinnes. There is no disproportion whence he may take any aduantage against the force of this exception. But yet further he maketh God by this meanes like vnto his needy creditour. For as the creditor must bee appeased by money, so must God by merit, and on both parts satisfaction is required. What it is wherewith the satisfaction is made it skilleth not, be it to God one way, and to the creditor another way; but on both sides there must be iust and worthy satisfaction. Hee would make vs beleeue, that God freely forgiueth nothing, but either wee must by merit puchase our release, or else wee must lye by it, till wee haue payed the vttermost farthing. Yea & that must be many times for money also: for although God himselfe take no mony for Pardons, yet the Vicar of Rome doth for him. An humble and contrite heart will not serue the turne, he must pay for it that will be pardoned. Thus *M. Bishops* shifts fall out amisse on euery side, and hee can say nothing to serue his turne. Better were it for him to yeeld to the truth, then thus to shame himselfe by fighting so childishly against it. In a word we tell him, that God indeed *esteemeth an humble and contrite heart, grieuing for sinne, and suing for pardon*, but hee esteemeth the same as suing for pardon, not as presuming of satisfaction. A strange suter is he, that thinketh suite to be satisfaction, or that by requesting a pardon he iustly deserueth to be pardoned. He alledgeth that it is said, [h] *Did not I forgiue thee the debt, because thou besoughtest me*, but yet he doth not find that it is said, I forgaue thee the debt, because by beseeching me thou madest me a ful recõpence & satisfaction for the debt. If he had made satisfaction therby, then it should not haue bin said afterwards, which *M. Bishop* should haue

h Mat. 18. 32.

remem-

remembred: [1] *His master was wroth, and deliuered him to the iaylers till he should pay all that was due vnto him.* There could nothing remaine due, where iust satisfaction had bene made. [1 Vers. 34.]

## 16. W. Bishop.

*Secondly, saith* M. Perkins: Fasting is a thing indifferent of the same nature with eating and drinking, no more conferring to the kingdome of heauen, then eating and drinking doth. *What an Epicurian and fleshly doctrine is this? Why then did the Ninuites fast, put on sack-cloth, and lye on the ground (all which bodily afflictions are reduced to fasting) rather then eate, and drinke, and presume of Gods mercy? if the one had bene as acceptable to God as the other? Why is* S. Iohn Baptist *commended for his rough garments and thin diet, if cherishing the flesh please God as well as punishing of it? Christ saith expressely:* That if we fast in secret, his heauenly Father will repay vs openly: *will hee reward eating and drinking so liberally? but of fasting we shall haue a whole Chapter hereafter. Therefore briefly I here conclude, that this doctrine tendeth to the establishment of the kingdome of* Atheists *and* Epicures, *whose sweet speech is:* Let vs eate, and let vs drinke, for after death there is no pleasure: *true for such belli-gods and their followers.*

## R. Abbot.

That fasting of it self is a thing indifferent neuer wise man made any doubt. No man euer yet in a right mind thought it to be a matter of vertue to keepe a mans belly emptie. Surely, if to fast be a vertue, then to eate and drink is a vice, because whatsoeuer is contrary to vertue is vice. If fasting of it selfe bee a good worke, a man may do a good worke against his will, because a man may be made to fast, when he hath more will to eate. But it might please his wisdome to vnderstand, that some things simply and of themselues are good: other some things simply and of themselues are euill: other some of themselues are neither good nor euill, but yet are instruments and may be vsed either to good or euill. Of this last kind are riches, health, strength, walking, sitting, waking, sleeping, mariage, virgi-

virginity, and such like, by which for the things themselues a man is neither the better nor the worse, but by a good man they may be applyed to good, and by an euill man to euill. Of the same nature are eating, drinking, fasting; for none of which can a man bee called better then another man, because they are things indifferently common both to good and euill, although by a good man they may be vsed to good. And therefore as *Iohn Baptist* came[a] *neither eating nor drinking, so the sonne of man came both eating & drinking*, to giue to vnderstand, that neither eating nor fasting of themselues do make vs any whit the more accepted in the sight of God. Neither did our Sauiour Christ by eating and drinking *cherish the flesh* in such sort as it is vnlawful to cherish the flesh which is ment of the vices, not of the substance of the flesh, by wantonnesse, intemperancy, and excesse, not by moderate and sober feeding and diet: in which respect let him remember what the Apostle saith, that[b] *neuer any man hated his own flesh, but loueth and cherisheth it, euen as the Lord doth the Church*: thereby noting them to be vnnaturall monsters rather then men, of whom he speaketh in another place, who place[c] *religion in not sparing the body, and not hauing it in any honor to satisfie the flesh*. As for the Niniuites, if they had but only fasted, they had done as good as nothing, what had they done more thē their cattle did? But they fasted to humble themselues to God, and to shew their feare of his iudgement, and for these things God vouchsafed to respect their fast. And thus he that[d] *fasteth in secret*, not to fast, but[e] *by fasting to cherish prayer*; not to afflict the body, but to affect the soule: that is, that vseth the one not for it selfe, but for the other, not for[f] *bodily*, but for *spiritual and godly exercise*, him the *Father seeth in secret, and will reward him openly*. It is not simply fasting, that God requireth, but humiliation and prayer; he requireth fasting accidentally, onely as a support and help therof. Therefore the doctrine of Popery is most absurd and senslesse, which maketh fasting distinctly by it selfe, and for it selfe, not onely an act of Gods worship, but also a matter of merit, such as whereby wee make satisfaction to God, and purchase of him the remission of our sinnes. *M. Bishop* alledgeth somewhat concerning fasting, as we see, but concerning this vse of fasting, thogh it were the matter in hand, he had nothing at all to say. As for his cauils they are handled before in[g] answer to his Epistle to the King. The kingdom

a Mat. 11.18. 19.
b Eph. 5.29.
c Col. 2.23.
d Mat. 6.17.18.
e Tertul. de pœnit. Ieiunijs preces alere.
f 1. Tim. 4.8.
g Sect. 28.

of

of Athiests & Epicures in the whole world doth not flouriſh more then in the Court and Church of Rome, and I do almoſt perſwade my ſelfe, that *M. Biſhop* in his owne conſcience is perſwaded that it is ſo. I doubt not but he would tell a pretty tale in this behalfe concerning their maſters the Ieſuites, but that now his tongue is tyed vp, and he muſt ſay no more, he hath bene taught what it is to tell vs tales out of their ſchoole.

17 W. BISHOP.

*Laſtly, he ſaith, that almeſ-deeds cannot be works of ſatisfaction for ſinnes: for when we giue them as we ought, we do but our duty, and wee may as well ſay, that a man by paying one debt, may diſcharge another, as to ſay by doing his duty, he may ſatisfie Gods iuſtice for the punishmẽt of his ſinnes. A man might ſuppoſe, that this man were pretily well ſeene in* Carolo Buffone, *that thus ruſleth in graue matters with his ſimple* Similes.

*That almeſ-deeds redeeme our ſins, purge vs from them & make all things cleane vnto vs, hath bene already proued out of holy Scriptures, I will ioyne thereunto this one teſtimony of that holy Martyr* S. Cypriã: Our frailty could not tell what to do, vnleſſe the goodnes of God by teaching vs the workes of iuſtice and mercy, had ſhewed vs a certaine way of preſeruing our ſaluation, which is that with almſ-deeds we might waſh cleane away the filth of ſins; which wee had contracted after Baptiſme. *The holy Ghoſt ſpeaketh in the Scripture and ſaith:* Sinnes are purged by almes-deeds and faith.

Serm. de opere & elee moſ.

*Now to* M. Perkins Simile. *We deny that a man is bound to giue all the almes that he can: we are bound to giue that which we may well ſpare, when there is great want: but almes (which is a part of ſatisfactiõ) is not giuen out of our ſuperfluitie, but ſpared from our neceſſarie vſes, and is many times beſtowed, when ther is no ſuch great need, vpon building Schooles, Colledges, Hoſpitals and Chapples. And this may ſerue to anſwer* M. Perkins Similes *againſt theſe three works of ſatisfaction. If any man deſire to know why we make ſpeciall reckoning of theſe three works, it is principally for two cauſes: Firſt, we being to ſatisfie, muſt performe it with ſuch things as be our owne, which be of three ſorts, either they belong to our ſoule, or to our bodie, or to our externall goods. The goods of our mind we offer to God by prayer, by faſting, and other reaſo-*

*reasonable bodily discipline, we exhibite vnto him* a liuing hoast, holy and pleasing God. *By almesdeeds we make him an agreeable present of our goods. Secondly, all sinne as* S. Iohn *teacheth, may be reduced into three principall heads.* The concupiscence of the flesh, *that is lechery, which is cooled by fasting & such like afflicting of the body:* Concupiscence of the eyes, *couetousnesse, which is purged and chased away by almesdeeds:* and pride of life, *which is suppressed by humble prayer, and often meditation of our owne miseries.* Rom. 12. 1. 1. Epist. 2.

R. Abbot.

*Simple similes*, saith *M. Bishop*. Now he may be taken for a very simple mã, who to answer *simple similes* is forced to vse such simple shifts. We may wonder at the blindnesse of these arrogant and presumptuous hypocrites, who thus stand vpon their terms with God, of doing more for him then they are bound to do, more then by dutie they owne vnto him. Euery man of common ordinary pietie and deuotion confesseth, that whatsoeuer we are, or whatsoeuer we haue, either within vs or without vs, we owe all to God. [a] *In him we liue, and moue, and haue our being.* Of his bountie we receiue, and by his mercy we enioy whatsoeuer we enioy. So little interest haue we in any thing in his sight, as that at his commaundement we are to leaue whatsoeuer we haue. In all the gifts therefore which we giue in his name and for his sake, we are to say and to acknowledge, *Tua ex tuis tibi offerimus, Of thine owne we offer vnto thee that which is thine owne*, and nothing but thine owne. And although God haue not determined vnto euery man all particular vses of those benefites wherewith he hath endowed them, yet he hath taught euery man to remember himselfe to be *the Lords steward* for that portiõ which he hath, and that to him he shall giue account of the disposing of it. He hath giuẽ euery man leaue to vse the same according to the state and calling whereunto he is called, and for the lawfull vpholding and increasing of it, and accordingly to haue respect of those that are his, [b] *for whom he that careth not to prouide, hath denied the faith, and is worse then an infidel*; but yet so, as that he otherwise also [c] *learne to do good works for necessary vses, that he be not vnfruitfull*; that as he is a member of the body of Christ, so he employ that which he hath as occasiõ requireth, to the publike benefit and [a] Act. 17. 28. [b] 1. Tim. 5. 8. [c] Tit. 3. 14.

and vſe of the ſame body. And this is one part of the thankes that we ow vnto almighty God, not to think much when there is cauſe to beſtow ſome part of that which we haue to the honor & ſeruice of him at whoſe hands we haue receiued all. Which, he that neglecteth to do, and turneth all to priuate vſe, and to the building of his owne houſe, bringeth vpon himſelfe the iudgement denounced by the Prophet, and commonly verified before our eyes, [d] *He that coueteth an euil couetouſnes to himſelf, that he may ſet his neſt on high to eſcape frō the power of euil, conſulteth ſhame to his owne houſe.* Now ſeeing all that we haue is Gods, and we can no way ſufficiently recompence the mercy that he hath ſhewed in beſtowing the ſame vpon vs, what extream madneſſe is it to imagine, that thereout we can yeeld him a iuſt and worthy price of redemption and ſatisfactiō for our ſins? Spare we neuer ſo much from our neceſſary vſes, and giue we neuer ſo much as it were out of our owne bellies, yet our conſciences ſhould tell vs that it is not the thouſandth part of that which God hath deſerued of vs; and ſhall we be ſo witleſſe as to thinke that that wee doe may be a ſufficient recompence for the wrongs that we haue done vnto him? It is worthy to be noted which the Apoſtle teacheth vs, that [e] *to be willing beyond our power to miniſter to the Saints is a grace of God beſtowed vpon vs.* It is the fruite of Gods loue towards vs to carry this minde towards thoſe that are his. What ſtrange men then are they, who of that which is the effect of Gods loue and mercie towards vs, will make a matter of our merite and deſert towards God? In a word, *M. Biſhops* anſwer is a moſt idle dreame; and becauſe we can do nothing but what we owe to God, and all infinitely too little to ſhew foorth our thankefulneſſe towards him, we muſt ſay as *M. Perkins* doth, that in giuing almes as we ought, we do but our dutie; and that to ſay that by almes-deeds we may ſatisfie for our ſinnes, is the ſame as to ſay, that a man by paying one debt may diſcharge another. But yet it concerneth them to ſticke hard for the maintaining of this deuice, for in all the ports of Rome there is not a ſhip that hath brought in more rich lading then this hath done. For hereby they haue had the commaundement of mens purſes, their goods and lands; and whileſt they haue borne them in hand, that from *neceſſary vſes* they muſt take ſomewhat for the redeeming of their ſins, they haue made them rob their wiues, their

d Habac. 2. 9. 10.

e 2. Cor. 8. 3.

their children, posteritie and friends, to bestow vpon *holy Church*, as they called, the gifts which they craued for themselues. By this pretence, like [f] *the Grashoppers* of Egypt, *they deuoured all that was greene vpon the earth*: whatsoeuer was delightsome and pleasant they found meanes to make it theirs. And hence came those rich endowments of religious houses, men vpon conscience of sinne sparing no cost, in false hope to find some comfort thereby, as [g] before was said. And this point of satisfaction was so much the more willingly entertained, because they that wer loth to trouble themselues with fasting and praying, yet found helpe enough hereby, for that [h] *almes may supply or serue in steed of the rest, inasmuch as by it a man in some sort buyeth for himselfe the other workes of satisfactiõ in them to whom he giueth almes*. This is the wonderfull vertue of the almes that is enioyned by a Popish Priest, that when a man neither fasteth nor prayeth, yet it maketh other mens fastings and prayers serue the turne for the remission of his sin. And this was the notable cosening deuice of those holy votaries, to make men beleeue (as before hath bene mentioned) that they had a facultie to transport their merits and satisfactions to the vse of them that were beneficial vnto them, verifying in themselues that which the Apostle *S. Peter* had prophesied of them, [i] *Through couetousnesse with fained words they shall make merchandize of you*. But *M. Bishop* here in malice to the Iesuits, quite passeth by religious houses, as if the almes of satisfaction did not belong to them. Howsoeuer he be outwardly pacified, yet *manet alta mente repostum*, it is neither forgotten nor forgiuen, if he knew which way to worke his will. As for Schooles, Colledges, Hospitals, Chappels, the building of them (if it be in the true faith of Christ) is a gratious and godly worke, but when they are so done, they are done as testimonies of our thankfulnesse and dutie to God, not as satisfactions for our sins. Now although he haue hitherto proued nothing as touching satisfaction, yet presuming that he hath so done, he ioyneth to that supposed proofe the testimony of *Cyprian*, saying that [k] *our frailty & weaknes could not tell what to do vnlesse the mercy of God helping vs had by shewing vs the workes of iustice & mercy, opened vs a way for the preseruing of our saluatiõ, that by almes deede we clense or wash away whatsoeuer filth of sin we contract after baptisme*. Which words of *Cyprian*, if we construe them in rigour as they sound, do containe a most dangerous and

f Exod. 10. 15.

g Answer to the Epist. Ded. sect. 31.

h Thom. Aquin. suppl. q. 15. art. 3. ad 3. Eleemosyna aliorum vices supplere potest inquantum alia satisfactiuis operis per eleemosynam quisque sibi meretur quodammodo in ijs quibus eleemosynam tribuit.

i 2. Pet. 2. 3.

k Cypr. de Eleem. Nec habebat quid fragilitatis humanæ infirmitas atque imbecillitas faceret nisi sterili pietate diuina subueniens iustitia & misericordiæ operibus ostensis viam quandam tuendæ salutis aperiret, vt fordes post modum quascunque contrahimus eleemosynis ablueremus.

and vnchristian assertion, and such as all men rightly minded do abhorre, that by Christ all our sins are forgiuen in baptisme whatsoeuer we haue done, but that whatsoeuer we sinne afterwards is to be purged and cleansed by our selues. Whereof it must follow, that we who are baptized in infancie haue no further benefite of Christs redemption, but that we receiue then for the freeing of vs from the bond of originall vncleannesse. Yea and if the way whereby after baptisme we are to be cleansed from our sinnes be almes, in what case must they be who onely receiue almes, and haue none to giue, & therefore want that meanes for the forgiuenesse of their sinnes? But the true doctrin of the Gospel setteth Christ before vs, not onely in baptisme, but afterwards also to be [l] *the Lambe of God that taketh away the sinne of the world. S. Iohn* being baptized, speaketh of himselfe amongst others, and saith it to them that are baptized, [m] *If any man sinne, we haue an Aduocate with the Fathers, Iesus Christ the iust, and he is the propitiation for our sinnes.* The true confession of which point of faith *S. Austin* deliuereth, in saying that [n] *the flesh of Christ is the true and onely sacrifice for sins, not only those which altogether are washed away in baptisme, but those also which afterwards steale vpon vs by the frailtie of this life, for which the whole Church crieth dayly in prayer to God, forgiue vs our trespasses, and they are forgiuen vs by that onely sacrifice for sinnes.* We learne here another maner of lesson then *Cyprian* there teacheth, that after baptisme not the sacrifice of our almes, but the onely sacrifice of the bodie of Christ is the remission of our sinnes. *M. Bishop* must giue vs leaue rather to beleeue *Austine* speaking according to the Scripture, then *Cyprian* speaking directly against the Scripture. And therefore wee aunswer him as the same *Austine* did the Donatists, when they alledged an Epistle of *Cyprian* against him, [o] *We do Cyprian no wrong to distinguish any writings of his from the authoritie of holy Scripture. We are not bound to the authoritie of this epistle (or sermon) because we account not Cyprians writings as canonicall, but consider them by the Canonicall Scriptures, and what therein agreeth to the authority of holy Scripture, we receiue it with his praise, but what agreeth not by his leaue we refuse it.* Albeit because we find *Cyprian* elsewhere acknowledging in the name of all the faithfull, that [p] *we haue Christ with the Father to be the aduocate for our sinnes,*

l Ioh. 1. 29.
m 1. Ioh. 2. 2.
n *August. cont. 2. epist. Pelag. li. 3 ca. 6. Caro Christi verũ est & vnicum sacrificium pro peccatis, non solùm his quæ vniuersa in baptismate dimittuntur; verumetiam his quæ post ex huius vitæ infirmitate surrepũt, propter quæ quotidiè vniuersa ecclesia in oratione ad Deũ clamat Ecclesia, Dimitte nobis, &c. et dimittuntur nobis per singulare sacrificium pro peccatis.*
o *Conc. Crescon. lib. 2. cap. 31. Nos nullam Cypriano facimus iniuriã cũ eius quaslibet literas à canonica diuinarum Scripturarum authoritate distinguimus, &c. Et cap. 32. Ego huius Epistolæ authoritate non teneor, quia literas Cypriani non vt canonicas habeo, sed eas ex canonicis considero, vt quod in eis diuinarũ scripturarũ authoritati congruit, cum laude eius accipio, quod autem non congruit, cum pace eius respuo.*
p *Cyprian. de orat. Dom. Ipsum habemus apud Patrem Aduocatũ pro peccatis nostris,*

thereby

thereby confessing the effect of Christs redemption to be extended to the whole course of our life, we dare not conceiue, howsoeuer his words be very harsh, that his meaning was so bad as thereby it may seeme to be. And to iustifie himself to conceiue no otherwise but that the washing and cleansing of vs from our sinnes amidst all our almes and deuotions consisteth not in that which we do, but in the bloud of Christ, he saith in another place, [c] *O mercifull Lord, how often haue I transgressed the rules of thy doctrine; how often (O holy Lord) haue I despised thy commanndements, and when thou saidst vnto me, Returne, I haue not returned; when thou threatnedst, I feared not, when thou wast good and gentle, I haue prouoked thee: beyond seuenty times seuen times I haue sinned against heauen and before thee. Who shall wash away so much filth? who shall take away the mucke that is thus growne together? Let Peter say what he will* (in refusing to be washed) *we haue need that thou wash vs, for we cannot wash our selues, but in all things that we do, we stand in need of the washing of thy pardon and mercy. With thee is the well of life, and the infinit deathe of mercies which haue bene from euerlasting: thou hast washed vs in baptisme, thou hast washed vs in thy bloud, thou alwayes washest vs by forgiuing our daily sinnes.* By these words he giueth plainly to vnderstand, that he did not think the washing and cleansing of vs to consist in the merit of our almes, but in the forgiuenesse of our sins. He confesseth that in all that we do, we stand in need of pardon, and therefore cannot be imagined to thinke that any thing that we do is a satisfaction for our sinnes. In the other words therfore we must conceiue his purpose to be onely to note and set forth the acts and affections of them who truly and faithfully seeke remission of their sins by the mercie of God in the bloud of Iesus Christ, albeit being instant and earnest, as men are wont to be to presse that that he had in hand, he runneth into inconuenient phrases and speeches, which otherwise stand not with the rule of Christian faith. Those workes of mercie and compassion towards our brethren, are the true fruites and effects, the consequents and companions of that contrite and broken heart, that repentance and faith to which God hath made the promise of his mercy, and therfore becausse in the doing thereof we find mercy, he so speaketh thereof as if by the works themselues we obtained that mercie, when yet it is not for the workes sake that God accepteth vs, but for Christs sake, whom by our workes

[c] Idem. ser. de ablu. pedum. Clementissime magister quoties ego doctrinæ tuæ transgressu sum? regulas quoties edicta tua Domine sancte sauentempsi, & cùm diceres mihi, Reuertere, non sum reuersus: cùm minarers, non timui: cùm bonus esses et lenis, exasperans fui. Vltra septuagies septies, in cœlum & coram te peccaui. Quis tot fœdes ablues? quis abradet stercora cœglobata? Quicquid dicat Petrus, necesse est vt ipse nos abluas; neque enim lauare nos possumus sed in omnibus quæ agimus indulgentia tua lauacro indigemus, &c. Apud te fons vitæ est, et miserationum quæ à seculo sunt profunditas infinita; abluisti nos baptismo, lauasti sanguine tuo, semper lauas quotidiana peccata donando.

we ſhew that we vnfainedly ſeeke, and do truly beleeue in him. And as for the place of Scripture which he alledgeth, though by error of the ſcribe perhaps it be, that there is noted in the margent *the fourth of Tobie*, yet theſe words not being found in *Tobie*, and the words that are in *Tobie* being cited afterwards, he therein alludeth vndoubtedly to a ſaying of *Salomon*, in the Prouerbes; but forcing the text, and putting in *almes and faith* in ſteed of *mercy and truth*. Which words of *Solomon*, if a whining aduerſary by inſtance and importunitie will vrge vpon vs to expound of *the mercie and truth of man*, it muſt be read and conſtrued according to the ſame meaning which is already expreſſed, [d] *In mercy and truth iniquitie ſhall be forgiuen*, that is, where mercy and truth are, there is forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, as to note the conditions of the perſons whoſe ſins are forgiuen, not the thing by vertue whereof they are forgiuen. But we haue no warrant of any other Scripture in any other meaning to tie it to our mercy and truth, and therefore muſt vnderſtand it of *the mercy and truth* of God, of which the Prophet *Dauid* ſpeaketh, when hauing ſignified the forgiueneſſe of the ſinnes of Gods people, and the nearneſſe of his ſaluation to them that feare him, he addeth for the cauſe thereof, [e] *Mercy and truth are met together*. Of which alſo the Euangeliſt *S. Iohn* ſaith, [f] *Grace and truth*, that is, *mercie and truth come by Ieſus Chriſt*. Thus then *by mercie and truth iniquitie is forgiuen*; not by any merite or worke of ours, not by any ſatisfaction that we can make, but by the mercie of God, truly performing the promiſe that he hath made of the remiſſion of ſinnes by the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt. As for the booke of *Tobie* noted as I ſaid in the margent, and from whence *Cyprian* afterwards alledgeth other words of *almes deliuering from death and purging all ſinne*, it is not of ſufficient authoritie to proue vnto vs any matter of faith, the ancient Church teſtifying of it, and the reſt of the ſame ſort, as *Hierome* and *Ruffinus* haue recorded, that [g] *they are not canonicall*, and S. *Auſtine* affirming that [h] *the writings which are not in the Canon of the Iewes* (as none are, but what they had written in their owne tongue) *are not with ſo great authority alledged in matters of queſtion and contradiction*. Albeit we will not diſauow thoſe words in that meaning, as I haue before expreſſed, that *almes deeds deliuer from death and purge vs from ſinne*, as arguments for proofe that wee are deliuered from death and purged from ſin,

[d] Prou. 16. 6.

[e] Pſal 85. 10.

[f] Iohn 1. 17.

[g] Hieron. prolog. galeat. *Igitur ſapientia Salomonis & Ieſus filii Sirach liber, & Iudith & Tobias non ſunt in Canone. Sic Ruffin in expoſ. Symb.*

[h] *Auguſt de ciuit. Dei. lib. 17. ca. 20. Aduerſus contradictiones non tanta firmitate proferuntur quæ ſcripta non ſunt in Canone Iudeorum.*

not

not as causes effecting and working the same purgation, or if we will vse the name of causes, as causes to our apprehension & knowledge, not as causes of the essence and being of the thing. But take all these speeches how we wil, it shal appeare (God willing) in the next section that they make nothing at al for *Ad. Bishop*, and that they are impudently wrested to that purpose for which hee alledgeth them. In the meane time for the conclusion of this section he telleth vs a reason why they make *speciall reckoning of these three workes* for satisfaction, but the ground of his reason fully ouerthroweth all the assertion thereof. *Being to satisfie* (saith he) *wee must performe it with such things as be our owne.* But say we, wee haue nothing of our owne, but whatsoeuer we haue is his, [i] *of whom, and through whom, and for whom are all things.* Therefore as before hath bin concluded, we cannot satisfie at all. Whether they be goods of the mind, or of the body, or externall goods, we owe all vnto him, and we do but pay him with his owne. His applying of the words of the Apostle to fasting is absurd. *Reasonable bodily discipline*, saith he; whereas the Apostle by [k] *reasonable seruice* meaneth that that is mentall and spirituall, and thereby agreeable to God, who is [l] *a spirit, and will be worshipped in spirit and truth*, not any [m] *bodily exercise which profiteth little*, as the same Apostle speaketh. So the other words of *a liuing sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God*, are misapplied to a particular act of fasting, hauing a generall reference to the whole course of a Christian life and conuersation. I omit the rest of his words as idle.

i Rom. 11. 36.

k Rom. 12. 1.
l Iohn 4. 24.
m 1. Tim. 4. 8.

## 18. W. Bishop.

*But now to knit vp this question: let vs heare briefly what the best learned and purest antiquity hath taught of this satisfaction done by man, and because* M. Perkins *began with* Tertullian, *omitting his auncient: let vs first heare what he saith of it in his booke of penance.* How foolish is it (*saith he*) not to fulfill our penance, and yet to expect pardon of our sinnes, this is not to tender the price, and yet to put out a hand for the reward: for God hath decreed to set the pardon at this price: he proposeth impunity to bee redeemed with this recompence of penance.

*His equall in standing, and better in learning,* Origen *thus discour-*

seth: See our good Lord tempering mercy with seueritie, and weighing the measure of the punishment in a iust and merciful ballance: he deliuereth not vp a sinner for euer. But looke how long time thou knowest thy self to haue offended, so long do thou humble thy selfe to God, and satisfie him in the confession of penance.

Hom. 3. in lib. Judic.

*That glorious Martyr, and most learned Archbishop S.* Cyprian, *is wonderful vehement against them that wold not haue seuere penance done by such as fell in persecutiō: saying:* That such indiscreet men labour tooth and naile, that satisfaction be not done to God, highly offended against them. *And saith further,* That hee who withdraweth our brethren from these workes of satisfaction, doth miserably deceiue them, causing them that might do true penance, & satisfie God their mercifull Father, with their prayer and works, to perish dayly, *and to be more and more seduced to their further damnation.*

Lib. 1. ep. 3.

Lib 3. ep 14.

S. *Basil saith:* Look to thy selfe, that according to the proportion of thy fault thou maist hence also borrow some helpe of recouering thy health. Is it a great and grieuous offence? it hath then need of much confession, bitter teares, a sharpe combat of watching, and vncessant and continued fasting: if the offence were light and more tollerable, yet let the penance be equall vnto it.

Orat. in illa verba, attende tibi. Idem Ambr. ad virg. lap. cap. 8.

*S. Gregory Nazianzē saith:* It is as great an euil to pardon without some punishment, as to punish without all pity. For as that doth loose the bridle to all licentiousnesse, so this doth straine it too much.

Grat. in sanct. bum.

By compassion on the poore and faith, sinnes are purged, therefore let vs be clensed by this compassion, let vs scoure out the spots and filth of our soules with this egregious herb that makes it white, some as wool, others as snow, according to the proportion of euery mans compassion and almes.

Idem de paup. amor.

*S. Ambrose saith,* Wee haue many helpes whereby wee may redeeme our sinnes: hast thou money? redeeme thy sinne, not that our Lord is to be bought and sold, but thou thy self art sold by thy sins, redeeme thy selfe with thy workes, redeeme thee with thy money. *And,* how could we be saued, vnlesse wee washed away our sins by fasting?

De Helia & Ieiun.

Epist. 82.

S. Hierome *maketh* Paula *a blessed matron say,* My face is to be disfigured, which against the commaundement of God I painted: my body is to bee afflicted that hath taken so great pleasure: my of-

often laughter is to be recompenced with continuall weeping: my silkes and soft clothing is to bee changed into rough haire. *Reade another Epistle of his to the same* Eustochium, *about the preserving of her virginity, and see what penance himselfe did, being a most vertuous yong man.* *Ad Eustoch. de custod. virg. Paul.*

*S. Augustin saith*, He that is truly penitent, looks to nothing else then that he leaues not vnpunished the sinne which he committed: For by that meanes, not sparing our selues, he whose high and iust iudgement no contemptuous person can escape, doth spare vs. *Epist. 54.*

*And* hee sheweth how that a penitent sinner doth come to the Priest, and receiue of him the measure of his satisfaction. *And saith directly against our protestant position*, That it is not sufficient to amend our manners, and to depart from the euill which wee haue committed, vnlesse we do also satisfie God for those things which we had done. *Lib. 50. hom. Hom 50. cap. 32. Cap. 15.*

*S. Gregory saith*, That sins are not onely to be confessed, but to be blotted out with the austerity of penance. *Lib. 6. in. 1. Reg.*

*I will close vp these testimonies with this sentence of our learned countryman venerable* Bede: Delight *(saith hee)* or desire to sinne, when we do satisfaction is lightly purged by almesdeeds and such like: but consent is not rubbed out without great penance: now custome of sinning is not taken away but by a iust and heauy satisfaction. *In Psal. 1.*

## R. Abbot.

Here *M. Bishop knitteth vp the question*, but he knitteth it (gentle Reader) with a bow-knot; if thou haue but skill to pull the right string, thou shalt presently loose all that he hath knit. Aske him, and let him tell thee the true state of the question heere disputed, and thou canst presently discerne, that of these so many testimonies by him alledged, there is none, not so much as one that carieth any shew or semblance to that for which hee citeth them. Such is the notable impostурage and cosinage of these false harlots, in laying together huge companies of the places of the Fathers to blind the eyes of simple men, who are not able to discerne whether they be applied right or wrong. I haue pointed at this matter before, but it commeth heere more fully to be declared. *M. Bishop* in

in the beginning telleth vs thus: *We are not here to treate of that publike penance which for notorious crimes is done openly, but of such priuate penance which is either enioyned by the Confessor, or voluntarily vndertaken by the penitent, or else sent by Gods visitation to purge vs frō that temporall paine which for sins past and pardoned we are to endure either in this life or in Purgatory, &c.* Mark that which he saith, gentle Reader, that *satisfaction* is not here ment *of publike penance for notorious offences*, but only *of priuate penance*, and that *for sins past & already pardoned*. That thou maist the better vnderstād this secret of theirs thou art to obserue that in sin they affirme two things, [a] *the violation of amity betwixt God and vs, and the violation of iustice.* For the *renewing of amity*, they say that *a man cannot satisfie*, because satisfaction must haue *acceptance with God*, and *acceptance presupposeth amity and friendship* Again, *satisfaction must haue some kind of equalitie*, in respect of the offence for which the satisfaction is made. That there may be such an equality, it is necessary *that as the offence hath a kind of infinity in respect of the obiect* (which is God) *so the satisfaction haue a kind of infinity in respect of the originall whence it hath beginning*. It must therfore *proceed from the spirit of God dwelling in man, or from man made by grace and charity the member of Christ and child of God.* When therefore a man by mortall sinne hath expulsed from himselfe grace and charity, he must first vpon his contrition and confession be reconciled and haue his sinne forgiuen, and afterwards must make satisfaction for the same sinne. For they will haue vs thinke that though God bee content to bee friends with vs, and in that respect to forgiue the sinne, yet he will haue satisfaction made to his iustice for the wrong and trespasse that we haue done him. Thou mayst not wonder that they be very earnest in the assertion of this matter, because vpon this ground Purgatory standeth, and consequently the whole reuenue of the Popes pardons, and of all their obsequies and deuotions for the dead. Now this being the point of their defence, that God hauing forgiuen and pardoned the sinne, there remaineth a satisfaction to be made by temporall punishment, which of all the Fathers by him alledged, speaketh any thing to that effect? He hath taken them al out of *Bellarmine*, but therin see the honesty & fidelity both of *Bellarmine* and him: peruse them, and consider of them again & again, and what doest thou find sounding to the proofe of their assertion?

[a] Bellar. de pœn. lib. 4. cap. 1. Cum homines in Deum peccant, an etiā simul & iustitiā violant? Ac prō amicitia reformanda, non potest homo Deo satisfacere nam satisfactio hominis erga Deum acceptatione ipsius Dei necessario indiget: acceptatio autem amicitiam præsupponit. Et præterea vt satisfactio sit aliquo modo ad æqualitatem, oportet vt sicut offensio habet infinitatem quādam ex parte obiecti, sic habeat satisfactio infinitatem aliquam ex parte principij satisfacientis. Proinde requiritur vt opera satisfactoria fiant à spiritu Dei hominē inhabitante, siue ab ipso homine vt membro Christi et filio Dei iam per gratiam & charitatē efficto, &c.

The

The Fathers ſpeak of a *ſatisfaction* for the obtaining of the forgiuenes of ſins, but of a ſatisfaction to be made when the ſin is forgiuē, they ſay neuer a word, yea they neuer imagined any ſuch thing. The church of Rome denieth that to be properly *a ſatisfactiō*, which the Fathers cal by the name of *ſatisfaction*, and knew no other but that, & yet that *ſatisfaction* they alledge for the proofe of their new deuiſed ſatisfaction. Yea *Bellarmine* himſelfe confeſſeth, that [a] *Where the Fathers do ſeem to attribute to the actions of men to reſtore amity with God, and to ſatisfie for the remiſſion of the ſin, they muſt bee expounded of ſatisfaction ex congruo, not ex condigno.* So had he ſaid before, that with the Fathers in that caſe, the words of [c] *merit, price, ſatisfaction, redemption, muſt be taken in that ſort.* And yet whereas all theſe Fathers alledged ſpeak of *price, ſatisfaction, redemption*, for the remiſſion of the ſin, he himſelfe bringeth them to proue [d] *ſatisfaction de condigno*, after the remiſſion of the ſinne. To ſpeake of them briefly in order as he reporteth them, the firſt teſtimony out of *Tertullian*, concerneth *publike penance*, the whole booke being written thereof, as [e] *Beatus Rhenanus* ſheweth in the argument of the ſame booke, & as by the author himſelfe appeareth, in that he ſpeaketh of ſuch a repentance as is [f] but once to be had after baptiſme, which was ſo ordered by the Church in publike penitency, but in priuate neuer neither would *M. Biſhop* plead ſo hard for it, if it were ſo. Now publike penitency was a ſatisfaction to obtaine forgiuenes, and ſo here *Tertullian* plainly expreſſeth, calling it [g] *a folly not to fulfill penance, & yet to expect pardō*, affirming the one to be *the price* for the other, and that *God hath ſet the pardon at this price.* This then being a price for the pardon, commeth not within the compaſſe of our queſtion, which is of a ſatisfaction when the ſinne is pardoned. *Origens* purpoſe in the ſame place alledged, is by the example of the deliuerance of the Iſraelites when they called vpon the Lord, to ſhew that the Lord deliuereth a mā to aduerſary powers [h] *to humble him that was exalted, to afflict him, to breake him vntill he repent & ſeeke the Lord*; exhorting to put away pride *leaſt the Lord bee angrie and giue vs vp into the hands of the enemy, that by the trouble of correction we learne that humility which wee ſhould haue taught in the knowledge*

[b] *Bellar. de pœn. lib. 1. ca. 1. S. veteres Patres interdum actionibus humanis tribuere id videtur vt Deū ex inimico amicū reddant, atq; adeò pro expianda culpa ſatisfaciant, interpretandi ſunt de ſatisfactione ex congruo, non ex condigno.*

[c] *Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 12. Vbi pœnitentia dicitur meritum, pretium ſatisfactio, redemptio pro peccato, de merito, & ex congruo accipienda ſunt.*

[d] *Lib. 4. cap. 9.*

[e] *Beat. Rhen. in argum. lib. Tert. de pœnit.*

[f] *Tertul. de pœn. Quicquid mediocritas noſtra ad pœnitentiam ſemel caſu offendam & perpetuò committendam ſuggerere potuit, omnis deliberatio Dominō ſpectat.*

[g] *Ibidem. Quàm ſtultum pœnitentiam non adimplere & veniam delictorum ſuſtinere? hoc eſt, pretium non exhibere, ad mercē manum emittere. Hæc cum pretio Dominus veniam addicere inſtituit, &c.*

[h] *Origen. in lib. Iudic. hom. 3. Et humiliet eum qui nimis fuerat exaltatus, vt affligat, vt conterat donec reſipiſcat & quærat dominum, &c. Abſtineamur ſuperbire ne forte ir. ſcatur Dominus & tradat nos, &c. & humilitatem quam in ſanctis Chriſti docere debuimus, in correptionis noſtræ tribulatione diſcamus: ſed vide benignum Dominum miſericordiam cum ſeueritate miſcentem, & iuſtas pœnas modum iuſtæ & clementi liberatione penſantem.*

of

*of Christ.* Hereupon he inferreth that aduertisement of Gods *tempering mercy with seuerity, waighing the measure of his punishment by a iust and mercifull consideration,* namely in that sort as he hath before deliuered,[i] *that in manner of a wholsome medicine, one contrarie may be cured with another.* Therefore he saith that[k] *God doth not giue ouer a sinner for euer,* as to note that all that hee doth is but to bring a man to repentance; which beeing done, hee is satisfied. Whereupon he giueth aduice to a man, that *according to the time that he knoweth himselfe to haue erred or offended, so he humble himselfe, and satisfie God in the confession of repentance; because* (saith he) *if thou reform and amend thy selfe, God is gracious & merciful to withhold punishment from him who preuenteth it by repentance.* Now what is all this, but that which the Apostle saith,[l] *If wee would iudge our selues, we should not be iudged of the Lord?* He exhorteth to preuent Gods iudgement, to humble our selues, to repent, to cast away our pride, to seeke God, to satisfie him by confession and acknowledgement of our sinnes, that God being gratious and mercifull may forbeare to punish vs, but we finde nothing of that that we seeke for, that hauing humbled our sinnes, and being reconciled to God, and hauing obtained forgiuenesse of our sins, we shal remain bound to punishment and satisfaction for our sinnes. The words cited out of *Cyprians* epistles, concerne them who in the time of persecution had fallen and denied Christ, whom hee would not haue to be restored to the communion of the Church vntill they had publikely lamented their grieuous fal, and giuen good tokens of their true and faithfull repentance. Therfore hee blameth them that too lightly and easily receiued them againe, heereby causing[m] *that they cõceiued not the wrath of God, that they feared not the iudgment of the Lord, that they knocked not at the Church of Christ, but without repentance and open confession of their sin had false peace preached vnto them with deceitfull words.* Here is therefore no speech of satisfaction after peace and reconcilement to God, but only for the obtaining of this peace. And this is euident by the very words cited by *M. Bishop,* wherein *Cyprian* blameth them that withheld men from[n] *satisfying God being angry;* and he applieth them against vs, for denying satisfaction when God is pleased. In the other place *Cyprian* saith, that *shewing true repentance they might by their praiers & works satisfie God to the procuring of mercy:* & *M. Bishop* alledgeth it to

i Tradidit humiliandos vt salubri medicinæ ratione contraria contrarijs curarentur.

k Non in perpetuum tradit delinquentes, sed quanto tempore arasse tu wisti, & tanto nihilominus tempore humilia teipsum Deo et satisfacito ei in confessione pœnitentiæ, & c quia si te ipse emendauueris, si te ipse correxeris, piu et misericors est Deus qui vindictam temperet ab eo qui illam pœnitendo præuenit.

l 1. Cor. 11. 31.

m Cyprian. lib. 1. epi. 3. Proponitur sacrilegis atque dicitur, ne ira cogitetur Dei, non timeatur iudicij Domini, ne pulsetur ad Ecclesiam Christi, sed sublata pœnitentia nec vlla exomologesi criminis facta pax à non veris presbyteris verbis fallacibus prædicetur, &c.

n Ibid. Elaborant ne indignanti Deo satisfiat.

o Lib. 3. epist. 14. Possint agentes pœnitentiam veram Deo patri ad misericordiam precibus & operibus suis satisfacere.

to proue a satisfaction when men haue already procured mercie. *Cyprian* speaketh of a satisfaction, for want whereof men [q] *perish*, and as *M. Bishop* translateth, *are sedneed to their further damnation*, and *M. Bishop* applieth it to a satisfaction, for want whereof men perish not nor are damned, but must make it vp in Purgatory fire. The words of *Basil* are as impertinent as the rest. He sayth nothing but what we say, that the greater wound should cause the greater paine, the greater sinne the greater sorow, that we may so much the more ernestly seeke reconcilement to God, by how much the further we haue departed frō him; but no shadow is there of satisfactiō to bē made after that we are reconciled vnto him. The last of his words containe the summe of all the rest: [q] *Let the repentance be equall or proportionable to the sin.* To the like sentence of *Ambrose* he referreth vs in the margent; [r] *A great wound had need of a very effectuall and long cure: a great sinne had need of great satisfaction.* The words immediatly going before are these: [s] *If the sinner spare not himself, then the Lord will spare him; and if in the short space of this life he shal recompēce the euerlasting pains of hel that are to come, he freeth himself from eternall iudgement.* It is apparent therfore that he speaketh of a satisfaction whereby to obtaine forgiuenesse of sinnes for the auoiding of the eternall paines of hel, not of a satisfaction after forgiuenesse, for the auoyding of the temporal paines of Purgatory. He writeth it to a virgin that had yeelded her self to be defiled and corrupted, and calleth her to publike and perpetuall penance, denying her any remission or pardon in this world. [t] *Continue in thy penance or repentance euen to the end of thy life, and do not presume that of mans day any pardon can be graunted thee, for he deceiueth thee that will promise that vnto thee. For thou which hast sinned properly against the Lord, must of him alone expect remedie at the day of iudgement.* A hard censure, and vnworthy of *Ambrose*, and so contrary to that which otherwhere he hath written, as that we may well question whether it be his or not; but it being plainly denied her to haue forgiuenesse, how deceitfully is this example brought to proue satisfaction after forgiuenesse? With as great fraud he alledgeth *Gregory Nazianzen*, who in that place inueigheth against the Nouatian heretikes, denying repentance to them that fell after baptisme, according to the censure now mentioned vnder the name of *Ambrose*. Against that rigor he saith, that [u] *in like sort are to be blamed both vnbridled*

p *Ibid. Seducti sunt vt magis timeant & quasi erigere possint, plus cadant.*

q *Basil. orat. in illud, Attende tibi. Adequetur peccato paenitentia.*

r *Ambr. ad virg. lapsam. Grauis plagæ altæ & prolixa opus est medicina; grande scelus grandem habet necessariā satisfactionem.*

s *Peccator si sibi non pepercerit à Deo illi parcitur, & si futuras paenas gehennæ perpetuas in hoc paruo vitæ spacio compensauerit, seipsū ab æterno iudicio liberat.*

t *Ibid. Inhære pœnitentiæ vsq; ad finem vitæ, nec tibi præsumas ab humano die posse veniam dari quia decipit te qui hoc tibi polliceri voluerit. Quæ enim propriè in Dominum peccasti, ab illo solo te cōuenit in die iudicij expectare remedium.*

u *Greg. Nazian. ora. 39 in sancta lumina. In eodē vitio sunt tā effrenata & omni animaduersionis metu soluta licentia, quā seua, nec vlla clementia temperata condemnatio; illa omnes habemus vitij laxamus, hæc vehementi ori astrictione præfrenamus.*

*bridled licence freed frō all feare of punishmēt & cruel condemning, not mingled or tempered with clemency and mercy; the on loosing the bridle to all vices, the other stifling men with ouermuch straitnesse.* Nicetas in his cōmentary thus expresseth it, [x] *They alike deserue to be reproued and punished, who either punish not offender at all, but giue them wholly the bridle, or do so cōdemne them as that they leaue them no hope to obtaine pardon.* He speaketh of the external gouernment & discipline of the Church, wherein he blameth that mē should be left at liberty to offend without feare of punishment; and again blameth such extremity & rigor, that offenders when they repent, should be excluded from hope of pardon: and what is this to proue that men being pardoned by God, must notwithstāding yet make him a satisfactiō for their sinnes pardoned? No man I suppose is so blind, but that he seeth the falshood of this citation. The other out of the same Father is of the same condition. He speaketh of mercy and compassion, as meanes [y] *to purge sins, to scoure out the spots and filths of our soules*; but he saith nothing of satisfactiō to be made after that those spots and filth are purged and scoured. Of the saying of *Salomon* which he alledgeth, I haue spoken in the former section: only it may be added, that whereas he for *mercy and truth* readeth [z] *By mercy and faith sins are purged*, or *iniquitie is forgiuen*, which the Hebrew text beareth very well, we may vnderstand it of Gods mercy in giuing, and our faith in receiuing the forgiuenes of sins, the promise thereof being made to them that beleeue in him. Again, he bringeth vs *Ambrose* speaking of *redeeming our sins with our mony, & washing away sins with fasting*; but we heare nothing of satisfaction or redemption after the forgiuenesse of our sins. Yea when he saith that *the Lord is not to be bought and sold*, he giueth vs to vnderstand, that he meaneth not that by our mony we purchase or merit at Gods hands, and therfore can not be said therby to make him satisfaction for our sins. That which he saith of *redeeming*, he wil haue it vnderstood of freeing our selus from the cords or bonds of our sins, that we may not be holden by the custome of them, whilest by well doing we resist and crosse the practise and lusts thereof, that they may not continue to bring vs vnto death. [b] *The Lord* (saith he) *is not to be bought and sold; but thou art so. Thou art sold to thy sins. Redeeme thy selfe by thy workes: redeeme thy selfe by thy mony. By one poison another poison is excluded: by the poison (of the Mammon of iniquitie) death is repulsed, life is preserued.*

Here

x Niceta ibid. in comment. Parem sententiam reprehensionē pœnāque merentur qui vel peccantes nulla pœna afficiunt ipsis; omnes habenas remittū; vel qui eos sic cōdemnant: vt nullam consequendæ veniæ spem illis relinquant.

y Orat. 27. de amore pauperum. Misericordia purgemur, animique labes et inquinamenta egregia illa herba detergamus &c.

z Misericordia & fide peccata purgantur.

a Ambr. de Helia & ieiun. cap. 16. Habemus plura quibus peccata nostra redimamus. Habes pecuniā: redime peccatum tuum, &c. Et ep. 82 Quæ nobis salus esse potest nisi ieiunio eluerimus peccata nostra?

b Ibid. Non venalis est Dominus sed tu ipse venalis es. Peccatis tuis venundatus es. Redime te operibus tuis: redime te iejuniis tuis, &c. Venenum veneno excluditur. Venenio mors repellitur vita seruatur.

Here is a redemption for the excluding of ſinne, not to pay a ſatiſfaction for it; to ſet vs free from the bondage of committing ſinne, not to purchaſe the forgiueneſſe of it. Nay of that he hath ſaid immediatly before, [c] *Let vs flie to the Phyſition who hath cured our former wounds, and if any bitternes be remaining, there ſhal not want a medicine. And if we haue done wrong, he wil forget it who hath once pardoned. Albeit we haue greatly offended, we haue a great Phyſition, we haue receiued the great medicine of his grace: for a ſtrong or great medicine taketh away great ſinnes.* That which is next alledged out of *Hierom* concerning *Paula*, ſignifieth her lamentation of her former life, and ſetteth out her repentance of her ſinnes, [d] *which being but ſmall*, as *Hierom* ſaith, *ſhe ſo bewailed, as that a man would haue thought her guiltie of grieuous offences*; but that proueth not that ſhe meant to make ſatiſfaction hereby for pardoned ſinnes, neither doth he ſay any thing to that effect. No more doth he as touching himſelfe in the other epiſtle to *Euſtochium*, where he ſheweth what hardneſſe he endured at the firſt in the wilderneſſe to ſubdue the heate and luſt of youth, hauing as he ſaith, [e] *for the feare of hell condemned himſelfe to that priſon*, but not ſo much as any word that he did any thing there for penance or ſatiſfaction for his ſinnes. This is ſo wiſely applied, as that we may well thinke *M. Biſhop* put it in of his owne head, there being nothing either in words or in matter likely to ſerue the turne. As little helpe hath he in the next citation which is out of *S. Auſtine*, who telleth *Macedonius* the Lieutenant concerning them who being condemned to death, had their liues and pardon begged by the Biſhops, that [f] *they kept many of them whoſe crimes were manifeſt from the participation of the ſacrament, that by repentance and puniſhing themſelues they might appeaſe him whom in their ſinnes they had deſpiſed.* Hereupon he inferreth: [g] *For he which truely repenteth, laboureth nothing elſe but not to ſuffer that euill which he hath done to be puniſhed: for by that meanes when he ſpareth not himſelfe, he is ſpared of him whoſe ſecret and iuſt iudgement no deſpiſer ſhall eſcape.* Which words being plainly deliuered of that repentance whereby God is appeaſed that he may not puniſh, what do they make to the proofe of a puniſhment which they ſay God inflicteth when he is appeaſed? Concerning this puniſhing of our ſelues, I refer thee to that which before hath bin ſaid by occaſion of another ſentence of *S. Auſtine* in the tenth ſection.

[c] *Ibid. Confugiamus ad medicum qui vulnera ſuperiora curauit, & ſi quid ſupereſt acerbitatis medela non deerit. Etſi quid iniurie fecimus memor non erit qui ſemel donauit. Et ſi grauia deliquimus, magnã medicã inuenimus magnam medicinã gratiæ eius accipimus. Magna enim medicina tollit pecc. Et magna*

[d] *Hieron. epit. ap. Paule. Ita leuia peccata plangebat vt eam grauiſſimorum criminum crederes ream.*

[e] *Hieron. ad Euſtoch. Ob generum metum tali me carcere ipſe damnauram.*

[f] *Auguſt. ep. 54. Quoſdam quos ſi manifeſta ſunt crimina à veſtra ſeueritate liberatos à ſocietate remouemus altaris, vt pœnitendo placare poſſint quem peccando contemſerant, ſeque ipſos puniendo.*

[g] *Nã nihil aliud agit quem veraciter pœnitet niſi vt id quod male fecerit impunitũ eſſe non ſinat. Eo quippe modo ſibi non parcenti ille parcit cuius ultã iuſtumq; inducit nullam contemptor euadit.*

The

The other place is manifestly spoke of publike penitency, *S. Austin* exhorting euery mā in the guilt of those sins of which the Scripture teacheth, that [h] *they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdome of God,* [i] *to pronounce sentēce against himself of a sharp medicine, to come to the Priests by whom the keyes of the church are minstred vnto him, & of them to receiue the maner or mesure of his satisfaction, that being deuout & humble in offering the sacrifice of a troubled or contrite hart, he may yet do that which may not onely do him good for the receiuing of saluatiō, but others also by example, that if his sin be not only to the grieuous hurt of himself, but also to the scandal of others, & it so seem to the Priest or Bishop expedient for the profit of the Church, he refuse not to do penance in the knowledge of many or of the whole church.* This is again a repentance for the receiuing of the forgiuenesse of sins & saluatiō, but no other satisfaction, required not onely for the good of the offender, but also for the good of other men & of the whole church, whereas *M. Bishops* satisfaction concerneth only the man himselfe to be deliuered from Purgatory paines. To the same effect is that which he citeth further out of the same Homily: [k] *It sufficeth not to amend our manners and to depart from euill doings, vnlesse for those things which we haue done we satisfie God by sorrow of repentance.* To what end that satisfaction is vsed, he sheweth presently after: *For it is not said only that we should abstaine frō sins, but pray to God also saith he* (namely Ecclesiasticus) *for the things that are past, that they may be forgiuē thee.* Here is all stil for forgiuenes of sins, but nothing of satisfaction when sin is forgiuen. So when *Gregory* saith, that [m] *sins are not only to be confessed, but also to be blotted out by austeritie of penance or repentance,* he speaketh of a penance for the blotting out of sin, not of penance whē the sin is already blotted out. So doth *Beda* expresly apply his speech *to the purging, the blotting out, the pardoning of sin.* [n] *Delight or desire to sin when we come to satisfactiō is lightly purged with almes deeds & such like; but consent is not blotted out by great repētance, but custome of sin is not pardoned but by iust and waightie satisfaction.* Thus (gentle Reader) of all that *M. Bishop* hath cited, yea and of all that *Bellarmine* hath cited, there is not one that speaketh of the point in question, as touching satisfaction after forgiuenesse of sins. No, it is a late deuice of the Schoolmen, which when they had

h Gal 5.21.

i *Augustī. hom.* 50. *Cum in se prætulerit seuerissimæ medicinæ sententiā veniat ad Antistites per quos illi in ecclesia claues ministrantur, & accipiat satisfactionis suæ modū vt in offerendo sacrificio cordis contribulati & humilis id tamen agat quod non solum illi prosit ad recipiendam salutē, sed & cæteris ad exemplum, vt si peccatum eius non solum in grauī eius malo sed etiam in scandalo est aliorum, atq; hoc expedire visitatis ecclesiæ videatur antistiti in mitigatione multorum vel etiam totius plebis agere pœnitentiam non recusct.*

k *Ibid. Non sufficit mores in melius commutare, & à factis mala recedere, nisi etiā de his quæ facta sunt satisfiat Deo per pœnitentiæ dolorem.*

l *Non enim dictū est tantùm vt absistamus à peccatis, sed & de præteritis, inquit Dominus deprecare vt tibi dimittantur.*

m *Greg. in 1. Reg. lib 6. Non solùm confitenda sunt peccata, sed etiam pœnitentiæ austeritate delenda.*

n *Beda in Psal. 1. Delectatio seu voluntas peccandi quando ad satisfactionem venitur lenis ēr eleemosynis & aliis talibus purgatur; consensu verò non nisi grauis pœnitentia delitur; consuetudo autem nonnisi rectis & ponderosa satisfactione absoluitur.*

had set it abroach, they desired to color and to giue it tast by citing sentences of the fathers as touching satisfaction, when as the Fathers speake of satisfaction in one meaning, and they apply them in another. But I suppose I haue not yet giuen thee full satisfaction, vnlesse I further adde somewhat as touching the auncient Fathers vsing of this terme of *satisfaction*. It is therefore to be vnderstood, that the same was first applied to that publike penance, whereby open and notorious offenders did satisfie the Church, that is, giue sufficient and approued testimony and assurance of their true and vnfained repentance for their sinnes. When any in the time of persecution had fallen by renouncing the name and faith of Christ, or had otherwise committed any great & scandalous trespasse to the grieuance of his brethren, to the obloquy of religion and slaunder of the Church, but especially to the offence of almighty God, and prouoking of his wrath, both against himselfe, and them also with whom he liued, he was by the publike censure of the Church secluded from the Communion, and cut off from the societie of the faithfull and godly, as vnworthy to be reckoned a member of Christ, or partaker of the hope that is by him. But yet ther was alwaies hope of restitution remaining to them who vpon conuenient triall were found penitent and grieued for the euill which they had done. To this purpose therefore they were enioyned [p] publike cõfession of their sinnes. They had their place appointed them in the Church, where they stood lamenting and mourning, & with weeping and teares cast themselues to the ground, praying to God for themselues, and commending themselues to the prayers of the assembly. It was prescribed them by watching, by fasting, by course, and vncouth apparel to afflict and humble themselues, that euery way their griefe & sorrow might be seene. Which being duly performed the Church was satisfied, and taking compassion on them restored them againe to brotherly societie, and to the communion of the Church, and hereof first was the name of *satisfaction* taken vp. It was not therfore a satisfaction whereby they meant to make God a iust recompence for their sinnes, or as by paying a price of woorth and value to merit and purchase their owne pardon, but onely a satisfaction whereby the Church would be certified of their true repentance towards God, as not enduring that any man should

[p] See hereof *Tertul. de pœnit. cõtis.* and the collections of *Bucanus Rhenanus* in the argument of that booke.

be accounted a member amongſt them, who by ſinne had made himſelfe a ſtranger to God, vntilll they ſaw reaſon to be perſwaded that God would be pleaſed to be reconciled to him againe. They could not looke into the heart to ſee any mans repentance and ſorrow, but by mens deuout ſubmitting themſelues to the ordinances of publike cenſure and diſcipline they would be induced to the perſwaſion thereof, and being thereof perſwaded, they receiued him againe whom before they had reiected. Hereof *Saint Auſtin* ſaith very plainely to ſhew the end of it; [q] *A contrite and humbled heart God deſpiſeth not, but yet becauſe commonly the griefe of one mans heart is ſecret to another, and commeth not by any words or ſignes to the certaine knowledge of others, being in the ſight of him to whom it is ſaid, My groning is not hid from thee, therefore rightly are there appointed certaine times of penance, that the Church alſo may be ſatisfied wherein ſinnes are forgiuen, becauſe out of it there are none forgiuen.* Here is the true vſe of thoſe publike ſatisfactions. It is true that God yeeldeth to the contrite and broken heart remiſſion and forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, but in ſcandalous treſpaſſes he will haue the knowledge thereof to be taken in the forgiueneſſe of the Church. A man in that caſe ſinneth not againſt God onely, but alſo againſt the Church, in prouoking Gods anger, as before was ſaid, not onely againſt himſelfe, but alſo againſt them, in corrupting others, ſo much as in him lyeth, by his euill example, in cauſing aduerſaries by that occaſion to ſpeake euill of the Church. God therefore would that as the Church is intereſted in the wrong, ſo it ſhould alſo be intereſted in the forgiueneſſe thereof, ſo as that in this caſe no man is to preſume of forgiueneſſe with God, who is not ſo much as in him lieth, reconciled to the Church of God. This our Sauiour Chriſt hath confirmed in the Goſpell: [r] *Whatſoeuer ye bind on earth ſhal be bound in heauen, and whatſoeuer ye looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heauen.* [ſ] *Whoſe ſinnes ye remit, they are remitted; whoſe ſinnes ye retaine, they are retained.* So then the forgiueneſſe of the Church is to be accounted as it were an admiſſion to forgiueneſſe with God, and a man taketh the one to be to him a confirmation of the other. Now the Church is to forgiue according to the ſame rule as God forgiueth, onely him that is penitent and grieued for his ſinne, and therefore in ſuch ſort, as hath bene ſaid, requireth *ſatisfaction* for certificate and aſſurance of ſuch repentance

[q] *Aug. Enchir. cap 65. Cor contritum & humiliatum Deus non ſpernit. Verum quia pleruſque dolor alterius cordis occultus eſt alteri, neq; in aliorum notitiam per verba vel quascunq; alia ſigna procedit cùm ſit coram illo cui dicitur, Gemitus meus à te non eſt abſconditus, reſtat conſtituum ur ab ijs, qui Eccleſiæ præſunt, tempora pœnitentiæ, vt ſic at etiam ſatis Eccleſiæ in qua remittuntur ipſa peccata; extra eam quippe non remittuntur.*

r Mat. 18 18.

ſ Iohn 20. 23.

tance. And this is ſpecially that *ſatisfaction* which is ſo much ſpoken of in the writings and recods of the ancient Church. But yet will *M. Biſhop* ſay, the matter is not ſufficiently cleared, becauſe howſoeuer the name of *ſatisfaction* might haue originall from hence, yet we find them to haue applied the ſame to God alſo, and to haue taught men by ſuch and ſuch works to ſatisfie and appeaſe the wrath of God. And we deny not indeed but that ſo they haue don, but yet we ſay, that they neuer ſpake of *ſatisfaction* in any ſuch meaning as the name of it now importeth in the Church of Rome. Farre were they from hauing any thought, that any thing they did could be a *ſatisfaction*, that is, a iuſt and ſufficient, and worthy recompence for their ſinnes: but yet they called repentance by the name of ſatisfaction, as to note that it is the thing wherewith God is ſatisfied, that is, contented and appeaſed, not for the thing it ſelfe, but for that he hath promiſed to accept thoſe paſſions and teares, and workes which are the iſſues and ſtreames of a broken and contrite hart, carefully ſeeking his mercy, and humbly craiuing remiſſion and pardon in the name of Ieſus Chriſt. In this ſenſe they tranſlated the name of *ſatisfaction* from the Church to God, and from publike to priuate repentance, neuer imagining, that any man would be ſo mad as to conceiue merit there where they taught the ſinner, to aske mercy, where they taught that the whole effect of that that is done conſiſteth in Gods mercy, through the merit of Ieſus Chriſt. [t] *Chriſt is made our attonement*, ſaith *Heſychius: therfore all the ſacrifice of repentance (or penance) is adminiſtred and done in him, and all that a man obtaineth by repentance is referred to him.* It is not then for our repentance ſake, but for Chriſts ſake, that in repentance we obtaine that mercy that we do obtaine. And to that purpoſe very notably ſeruеth that which *Chryſoſtome*, mouing queſtion in the name and behalfe of a ſinner, and making anſwer thereto, very learnedly & religiouſly ſpeaketh in this ſort: [u] *I haue ſpent all my life in ſinne, and if I repent, doſt thou thinke I ſhall be ſaued? Yea verily*, ſaith he. *But how ſhall I be certaine of that? or what perſwaſion can induce me to thinke ſo? I take aſſurance hereof from the mercie of the Lord, not from thy repentance. For thy only repentance*

t Heſych in Leuit 7. lib. 2. Chriſtus nobis propitiatio factus eſt, ergo in ipſo omne pœnitentiæ ſacrificium miniſtratur & agitur, & omne quod ex pœnitentia quis conſequitur adeum refertur.

u Chryſoſt. de pœnit. hom. 3. ſiue in Hypomnemate in Eſaiã, Cùm omnẽ vitam in peccatis detriuerim, ſi me pœnituerit ſam-

ne ſaluus? Prorſus ſis. Vnde hoc liquet? Ab ipſa Domini tui benignitate, non ex tua pœnitentia mihi ſumo fiduciam. Pœnitentia enim tua præualet tantam abſtergere malorum eluuiem. Pœnitentia ſi ſola fuerit, merito tibi metuendum eſt, ſed quoniam pœnitentiæ Dei clementia, Deique pietas iuncta eſt, confide.

*auaileth not to wash away so great filth of sin. If there be thy only repentance, thou art iustly to be afraid, but because Gods mercy & cõpassion is ioyned with repentance, therefore be of good cheare.* Here is nothing attributed to repentance for it selfe, but onely to the mercy of God vouchsafing to yeeld fauour and forgiuenesse to the repentant. Therefore do they hang the whole fruit of repentance vpon faith: for [x] *faith*, saith *S. Austin, is the foundation of repentance, and the repentance which proceedeth not from faith is vnprofitable.* [y] *We are so to beleeue*, saith *Ambrose, both the doing of penance, and the yeelding of pardon, as that notwithstanding we hope for pardon, as by faith, and not as of debt.* Here is then no popish opinion of penance and satisfaction expecting remission by way of debt and duty as a thing deserued, but in the middest of our repentance or penance, we are taught to hope for pardon onely by the faith of Iesus Christ. Therefore *S. Bernard* saith, that [z] *it is the onely suffering of the second Adam, that purgeth vs whom the only offence of the first Adam did defile; I say not* (saith he, alluding to that which before he hath said concerning repentance and mortification) *that any mans owne satisfaction can suffice him: for what is all our repentance, but onely that if we suffer not with him, we cannot raigne with him.* By our repentance then which he expresseth before in weeping for our sinnes, in bearing our crosse, in mortifying our members, in offering our selues a sacrifice to God, herby he saith we become like vnto Christ in suffering, and so are fitted to raigne with him, but yet the purging of vs from sinne he denyeth to these things, and reserueth it to Christ alone. For wee may aske as *Ambrose* doth: [a] *By what paines or by what sufferings (or bearing of wrongs) can we abate or ease our sinnes?* By which question he plainely declareth, that they did not hold the paines and sufferings of repentance or penance to be properly any purgation or satisfaction to take away sinnes. And this appeareth by *Saint Austine*, when he saith: [b] *What propitiation is there but sacrifice? What sacrifice but that which was offered to vs? the innocent bloud being shed, hath blotted out all the sinnes of offendours.* To which purpose elsewhere he saith, that [c] *for the singular and onely true sacrifice, the bloud of Christ was shed for vs.* But most religiously and Christianly is that spoken which hee saith

x *Aug. de vera & falsa pœnit. cap. 2. Fides fundamentũ est pœnitẽtiæ, &c. Pœnitẽtia itaque quæ ex fide nõ procedit, vtilis nõ est.*

y *Amb. de pœnit. lib. 2. ca 8. Ergo et agendã pœnitentiã & tribuendã veniã credere nos cõuenit, vt veniam tamen tanquã ex fide speremus, non tanquã ex debito.*

z *Bern. de verb. Iob. In sex tribulat. Soli nimirum secundi Adæ tribulatio purgat, quos cõtaminauit offensio sola prioris; non quod propria cuiquam sufficere possit satisfactio. Quid est enim omnis pœnitentia nostra, nisi quod si non cõpatimur, omnino non possimus cõregnare?*

a *Ambros. in Psal. 118 Ser. 20. Quibus laboribus, quibus iniurijs possimus nostra lauare peccata?*

b *Aug. in Psal. 129. Quæ propitiatio ista nisi sacrificium? Et quod est sacrificium nisi quod pro nobis oblatum est? Sanguis innocens fusus deleuit omnia peccata nocentium. sanguis effusus est,*

c *Idem contra aduers. Leg. & proph. lib. 1. cap. 18. Singulari & sola vero sacrificio pro nobis Christi*

yet

yet in another place: [d] *It is the one onely hope of all the godly groning vnder this burthen of corruptible flesh, and in the infirmitie of this life, that we haue an aduocate with the Father Iesus Christ the iust, and he is the propitiation for our sinnes.* If there be no propitiation, that is, no satisfaction, but only sacrifice, & no sacrifice, but the bloudshed of the Son of God; if our onely hope with God be this, that we haue with him Christ for our aduocate & attonemēt for our sins: if by all our paines and sufferings we cannot ease our selues as touching our sinnes, but onely the suffering of the second *Adom* be the purgation thereof; if amidst all our penances we are to hope for pardon by faith, that is, by fauour and not by debt, not trusting to any merit of our repentance, but to the mercy of God, and referring all the fruite thereof to Iesus Christ, then farewel Popish satisfaction; the Fathers that speake of satisfaction say nothing for that satisfaction: but at Rome this brat was borne, and we must leaue it to be buried there. The Fathers haue spoken of redeeming our sinnes, purging our sinnes, washing our sinnes, blotting out our sinnes by prayers, by almes-deeds, by fasting, by good workes, but amidst this improprietie of words they haue retained, as we see, a faithfull acknowledgement of the true Christian faith. Albeit, why do I speake of improprietie of words as in them, when we our selues vpon occasion forbeare not to speake as they haue spoken? For which of vs is there that maketh question to say, It is a satisfaction to God, when a sinner turneth from his euill way: repent thee of thy sins, amend thy wicked life, humble thy selfe before God, aske mercy and forgiuenesse, and God is satisfied. Redeeme thy former cruelties with mercie, thine oppressions with almes-deeds, and let the Mammon of iniquitie serue thee for the sauing of thy soule. Wash away the filth of thine vncleannesse with bitter teares, and with fasting and mourning blot out the guilt which the delights and pleasures of sinne haue written against thee. Thou hast hitherto bene retchlesse towards God, make him recompence hereafter both in thine owne deuotion and care, and in seeking the recouerie of other men. Thus we speake, and who doth not thus speake, both in this kind and in other sort also, when yet we impute not to those things which we commend, any vertue or cleansing or washing of vs from our sins, but onely intend to note the affections and dispositions which are the fruites and testimonies of that true faith and repentance, wher-

d *Idem contra 2. Epist. Pelag. lib. 3. cap. 5. Omnium piorum sub hoc onere corruptibilis carnis & in huius vitæ infirmitate gementium spes vna est, quod aduocatum habemus &c.*

by we ſeeke the waſhing away of our ſinnes onely in the bloud of Jeſus Chriſt. And if we ſometimes doubt not thus to ſpeake, how much more ſecurely would the Fathers vſe ſuch phraſes, when yet there was no feare of thoſe miſconſtructions of hereſie and Apoſtaſie, which haue ſince preuailed in the Church of Rome? We haue ſeene *Bellarmine* before acknowledging out of their principles, that the Fathers in theſe phraſes imported only *merit of fauour and grace, not merit of woorth and purchaſe*, and therefore ſetting a ſide the name of merit, let vs not doubt but that they meant in all their ſpeeches to vphold the grace and fauour of God by the mediation of Ieſus Chriſt. They taught men amidſt all their deuotions to aske pardon of Gods mercie, and therefore could not be thought to teach thē, that by the ſame deuotions they did deſerue it. In a word I conclude this point, with a ſpeech or two of *Chryſoſtomes*, which I wiſh thee gentle Reader to compare with the doctrine which *M. Biſhop* here hath brought vs from Rome: [e] *I teſtifie* (ſaith he) *& giue thee warrant, that if any of vs who are ſubiect to ſinne (or guiltie of ſin) do heartily and truely promiſe vnto God neuer to returne to the ſame againe, God doth require no further ſatisfactiō.* Againe, vpon the words of the Apoſtle, [f] *If we would iudge our ſelues we ſhould not be iudged of the Lord*, he ſaith thus: [g] *The Apoſtle ſaith not, If we would puniſh our ſelues, If we would take reuenge of our ſelues, but If we would iudge our ſelues, that is, if we would only acknowledge our ſinnes, if we would condemne our ſelues, we ſhould be deliuered both from the puniſhments of this world, and of the world to come.* Here we ſee, that after true repentance, there is no further ſatisfaction: that after true acknowledgement and confeſſion of our ſinnes, there is no reſeruation of puniſhment, but by the mercie of God wee are ſet free both from the puniſhments of this world and of the world to come, whereby all that *M. Biſhop* here hath built, is vtterly ouerthrowne.

e *Chryſoſt. de beato Philogonio. Ego teſtificor ac fidē habeo quod ſi quiſquam noſtrum qui peccatis obnoxij ſumus, ex animo vereq; promittat Deo ſe poſteà nūquam ad illa rediturū, nihil aliud Deus requirat ad ſatisfactionem vlteriorem.*

f 1. Cor. 11. 31.

g *Idem in 1. Cor. hom. 28. Non aix it ſi puniremus, ſi ſupplicium de nobis ſumeremus, ſed ſi diiudicaremus, hoc eſt, ſi noſtra tantūm voluerimus peccata cognoſcere, ſi condemnare noſmet ipſos, liberaremur vtique & ab huius & à futuri ſeculi ſupplicijs.*

## 19. W. Bishop.

*And if you pleaſe in few words, to heare the Proteſtants workes of penance and ſatisfaction, inſtead of our faſting, and other corporall correction, they fall to eating, and that of the beſt fleſh they can get, and take in the Lord all ſuch bodily pleaſure, as the company of a woman will affoord. In lieu of giuing almes vnto the poore, they pill them by fines and vnreaſonable rents: and by vſurie and craftie bargaines, are*

not

*not ashamed to cosen their nereſt kinne. Finally, in place of prayer, and washing away their owne ſinnes by many bitter teares, they ſing merrily a Geneua Pſalme, and raile or heare a railing at our imagined ſinnes, or pretended errours. And ſo leaue, and lay all paine and ſorrow vpon Chriſts ſhoulders, thinking themſelues (belike) to be borne to pleaſure and paſtime, and to make merry in this world.*

R. ABBOT.

A ſhrewd wench hearing her mother at angry words with her neighbour, and well knowing her mothers deſert, gaue her this counſell, Call her whore firſt, mother, for feare leſt ſhe call you whore. *M. Biſhop* knew very wel, that there is ſufficient cauſe for vs to call his mother *whore*, and to vpbraid the Church of Rome with the poiſoned and abominable fruites which their doctrine of *ſatisfactions* bringeth foorth. Therefore he thought it good policie in her behalfe to follow the counſell of the vnhappy girle, and to call whore firſt, that by laying ſome ſlanderous imputation of euil behauiour vpon vs, he might breake & abate the odiouſneſſe of thoſe vncleane & filthie corruptions which he knew were iuſtly to be obiected againſt them. He knew wel, that if we ſhould paint them out from top to toe, we ſhould make the Church of Rome to appeare a monſter, moſt vgly and deformed, ſuch as that all men may thereby take iuſt occaſion to deteſt her. To giue him ſome taſte of their good fruites, let him remember that of the Court of Rome it was ſaid long ſince:

*Eius auaritiæ totus non ſufficit orbis :*
*Eius luxuriæ meretrix non ſufficit omnis.*
*The world too little is their couetiſe to ſatisfie,*
*No harlots are enough to ſerue their filthy lecherie.*

[a] Math. Pariſ. in Henrico 3.

[b] Ibi. Manifeſtè compertum eſt Eccleſiã Romanam Dei indignationem incurriſſe. Ipſius enim magiſtratus & rectores non populi deuotionẽ, ſed marſupia plena quærunt: denariorum; non animas Deo lucrifacere, ſed reditus capere & pecunias congregare, religioſos opprimere, pœnã, vſuras, ſimonias & aliis diuerſis argumentis aliena vſurpare. Nemcuratur de iuſtitia & honeſtate, &c. Adeo mualitat Romana Eccleſia vnſa iabilu cupiditas confundens faſq; neſaſque, quod depoſito rubore veluti meretrix vulgaris & effrons omnibus venalis & expoſita, vſuram pro paruo, ſimoniam pro nullo inconuenienti reputant, & vt alias prouincias ſua contagione macularit, &c. Extat Curia Papalis vſque ad nubes fumum teterrimum exhaluit.

*It is manifeſtly found, ſaith Math. of Paris, that the Church of Rome hath incurred the indignation of God. The gouernours and rulers thereof do not ſeeke the deuotion of the people, but the filling of their owne purſes; not to gaine ſoules to God, but to take rents and to gather mony, to oppreſſe them that are religious, by penaltie, vſurie, ſimonie, and di-*

uers other deuices to get other mens goods into their hand; there is no care of inst & honest dealing. The insatiable couetousnes of the Church of Rome is growne to that passe confounding right and wrong, as that being past blushing, like a common and shameless harlot, setting her selfe to sale, and being exposed to all men, she accounteth vsurie for a small inconuenience, & simonie for none: so as that with her contagion she hath defiled other countries. The stinch of the Popes Court hath breathed out a most noysome fume euen to the very clouds. Of those times *Abbas Vrspergensis* speaketh in this sort: [c] *Then began mischiefes to be multiplied vpon the earth: for there arose among st men discords, deceits, treacheries, treasons, so as that they betrayed one another to death and destruction. Spoyling and preying one vpon another, destructions and wastings of countries, burnings, seditions, warres and rapines, whether in the streets, or in places of robberies were iustified, so as that now euery man is guilty of periurie, and wrapped in these foresaid wicked acts, and it cannot be excused, but that as the people is in these things, so is the Priest.* *Platina* the Popes Secretarie breaketh out in passion thus: [d] *What do we thinke shall befall in this our age, wherin vices are grown to that, that they haue scant left any place of mercy with God? How great the couetousnesse of Priests is, especially of them that are in place of gouernement, how great their lisentiousnesse affected euery way: their ambition and pompe, their pride and sloth, their want of knowledge both of themselues and of the doctrine of Christ, how little deuotion, and that more counterfeited then true, how corrupt their manners are, so be detested euen in profane and secular men, it skilleth not to say any thing, for that they sinne so apparently and openly, as if they sought to be commended for it.* And in another place thus: [e] *Now is pietie and deuotion waxen so cold, as that I say not bare footed, nay hosed and booted, they scant vouchsafe to pray. They weepe not as they go, or when they are at the sacrifice, but they laugh and that impudently, I speake euen of them whom their purple garments grace aboue other men: they sing not the Hymnes, for that seemeth a base matter, but they tell one another iests and tales to make each other laugh. The more prating and sawcie a man is, the more is he thought in this corruption of manners worthy to be*

c *Alba. Vrspergensis in Chr. Hæc cæperunt multiplicari mala in terra. Orta siquidē sunt in hominibus simultates, dolus, perfidiæ, traditiones vt se inuicē tradant in mortē & interitū. Rapinæ, depredationes, depopulationes terrarū, vastationes, incēdia, seditiones, & bella & rapinæ, siue in stratis siue in latronicijs iustificatæ sunt, vt omnis homo iam sit periturus, & prædictis facinoribus implicatus, vt vix excusari possit quin sit in his sicut populus sic & sacerdos.*

d *Platin. de vit. Pontif. in Marcellino. Quid futurum nostræ ætati arbitramur quia vitia nostra eò creuere vt vix apud Deum misericordiæ locū nobis reliquerint? Quanta sit auaritia Sacerdotum, quanta libido vndique conquisita, quanta ambitio & pompa, quanta superbia & desidia; quanta ignoratio tum sui ipsius tum doctrinæ Christianæ, quam parua religio & simulata*

*pietas quam vera, quam corrupti mores, vel in prophanis hominibus quos seculares vocant detestanda, nihil attinet dicere, cùm ipsi ita aperte & palam peccent: adeò inde laudem quærerent.* e *Idem in Stephano 3. Nunc adeò refrixit pietas & religio, non dico nudis pedibus, sed caligati & cothurnati vix supplicare dignantur. Non stant inter eundum, vel dum sacrificatur, sed rident & quidam impudenter de his etiam loquor quos purpura insigniores facit. Non hymnos canunt, id enim seruile videtur: sed iocos & fabulas ad risum concitandum inter se narrant. Quò quis dicatior est & petitum ior, eò maiorem in tam corruptis moribus laudem meretur. Seueros & graues viros reformidat hic xoster clerus.*

com-

commended; our Clergie brooketh not staied and graue men. [f] The ecclesiasticall state hath giuen it selfe ouer to all luxurie and wanton lust. *Mathew* of Paris said of the time wherein he liued, [g] *In these times he that is not a bad man, is thoght to be very good; the vninst man whē he forbeareth to hurt, is deemed to do good.* Yea, and *Machiauel* one of the fathers of the Romish generation, yet did not doubt to say further, that [h] *no where was there lesse pietie or religion, then in those that dwelt neerest to Rome.* I do here but point at some few things that come next to hand, but he that would discourse this matter as it deserueth, and would gather the flowers of Romish conuersation out of their owne stories, or set forth the sanctified behauiours that are to be seene at Rome, at Venice, in Italy, Spaine, Portugall, Fraunce, amongst this Catholike generation, yea or discouer the prety trickes of many of our Catholikes here at home, should make it cleare enough that *M. Bishop* doth but play the hypocrites part, in offering to [i] *plucke a mote out of his brothers eie, and not seeing the great beame that is in his owne eie*; it would appeare that he hath smal cause to bragge of the fruites of their doctrine of Pardons and satisfactions. [k] *A madde and pernicious doctrine*, as *Marsilius Patauinus* called it long agoe, *the beguiling of soules, worthy to be despised, and fit to be taken heede of of all Christian men: by which* the Germanes complained, [l] *that the religion of Christ was abandoned & extinguished with them, for that euery man for a summe of mony bestowed vpon pardons promised to himselfe a liberty to sinne without any punishment. Hence whoredomes*, say they, *incests, adulteries, periuries, murthers, thefts, robberies, vsurie, and the whole sinke of mischiefes haue had their beginning. For what will men feare any longer, when they be perswaded, that for mony, though it be much, not in this life only, but after death also they may get a licence and impunity of sinne:* And indeede it is true which *Hierome* saith, that [m] *men more easily set light by their mony, then they do by their pleasure,* [n] *neither doth any feare that which he may redeeme or buy out for mony*, as *Cyprian* speaketh. Therefore when they perswaded men that they might satisfie for their sinnes, and that almes was the most speciall worke of satisfaction, and did supply the want of other satisfactions, as before was said, they that

[f] *In Gregor. 4.*
[g] *Mat. Paris. in Hen. 3. anno 1252.*
[h] *Machiauel. disput. de rep. Li. cap. 12.*
[i] *Mat. 7. 3.*
[k] *Marsil. Patau. de sens. patib. part. 2. cap. 26.*
[l] *Cent. gravam. German. art. 3.*
[m] *Hieron. in Mat. 19.*
[n] *Cyprian. lib. 2. epist. 2.*

*Adeo in omnem luxū & libidinem fese effundit Ecclesiasticus ordo.*
*Qui hic temporibus malus non est, optimus reputatur: Iniquus cùm ladere cessat, prodesse iudicatur.*
*Nusquam minùs vel pietatis vel religionis est, quàm in iis hominibus qui vicinores Romæ habitant.*
*Marsilius Patauinus. Venia promissio perniciosa & insana doctrina & seductio animarum à Christianis omnibus contemnenda & cauenda.*
*Prostigata. Christi pietas & extincta, quando quilibet pro modo pretij quod in merces illas expendit peccandi impunitatem sibi pollicetur.*
*Hinc supra incestus, adulteria, periuria, homicidia, furta, rapinæ, fœnora & totam malorum seminem traxerit.*
*Quid enim malorum amplius iam horrebunt mortales, quando sibi peccandi licentiam & impunitatem vitæ sed & post obitum are licet immodice comparari posse persuasam habent?*

were

were of ability to giue almes liberally, that is, to ſtop the mouthes of begging Friers, were hereby thruſt forward to all manner wickednesse, which either by ſecreſie they could conceale, or wherein by power they could vphold themſelues, that humane lawes might take no hold of them. Theſe things are more apparent both by ſtorie and by ſight, then that *M. Biſhops* wit can ſerue to colour or hide them. It is nothing therefore that he telleth vs of their faſting, and almes, & praiers, in as much as they do theſe things to purchaſe thēſelues liberty to ſinne freely, and to take their pleaſure otherwiſe. And whatſoeuer he can otherwiſe alledge hereof, he is to remēber that *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, that [o] *counterfeit almes, and faſting, and praier, are the ſheepes clothing that ſerue to couer rauening wolues.* With theſe *ſheepes garments* the Phariſees of old couered their biting and deſtroying of ſoules. They were [p] *a moſt ſtraite ſect*, they *faſted twice a weeke, they lay ſome vpon thornes, other ſome vpon ſtones, other ſome vpon boords of ſmall bredth, that they might eaſily fall beſide, by this meanes to afflict themſelues with watching, that they might attend to praying, they vowed continencie; ſome for foure, ſome for eight, ſome for ten yeares.* By theſe diſſembled deuotions they crept into the minds of the people, they ſeduced and beguiled them, and held them bound to their traditions, and [q] *deuoured widowes houſes vnder pretence of long prayers.* By the ſame pretences *M. Biſhop* and his fellowes [r] *creepe into houſes, and leade captiue ſimple women laden with ſinnes, and led with diuers luſtes*, and make them their inſtruments for the [ſ] *ſubuerting* of the husbands and *whole houſes*, and intangling of them, with the ſuperſtitions and abhominations of the man of ſinne. Albeit being more cunning then the Phariſees, they take ſuch good courſe with their *faſting and corporall afflictions*, as that they neither abate their fleſh nor their filthy luſt, but by practiſe of ſhrift and confeſſion, they inſinuate themſelues into the affections and ſecrets of the ſame woman, and thereby take aduantage againſt them to gaine them to their will. He twiteth vs with taking pleaſure in the company of a women, but they by not being tied to the lawfull company of one, do reſerue to themſelues a liberty of abuſing many. And no maruell that ſuch good fruites proceede from them, with whom it is a poſition, that [t] *it is greater ſacriledge for a Prieſt to mary, then to commit fornication or to keepe a concubine*, yea [u] *that by keeping many harlots he ſinneth not ſo much.* As for vs we liue

in

o *Chryſoſt. Op. imper. in Mat. hom. 19. Quæ ſunt veſtimenta ouilia? Species videlicet ſimulatæ religionis; eleemoſyna ſimulata, oratio ſimulata, ieiunium ſimulatum, & cætera ſpecies pietatis quibus ſe veſtiunt lupi rapaces.*

p Act. 26. 5. *Epiphan. hær. 16. de Phariſeis.*

q Mat. 23. 14. r 2. Tim. 3. 6.

ſ Tit. 1. 11.

t *Coſter. Enchirid. cap. 15. propoſ. 9. Sacerdos ſi fornicetur aut domi concubinam foueat, tametſi grauiſ ſacrilegio ſe obſtringat, grauius tamen peccat ſi contrahat matrimonium.*

u *Campeg. apud Sleidan. Comment. lib. 4. Si ſacerdotes maritis fiant multo eſſe grauius peccatū quàm ſi plurimas domi meretrices alant.*

in mariage as did *Abraham*, [x] *the father of all that beleeue*, as *Isaac*, *Iacob*, the Patriarkes, the Priests, the Prophets, and other righteous men, and as the first Christians did, who all pleased God, and were accepted in his sight. We know there is no offence in mariage, because it is the ordinance of God, but we detest their vowed virginitie, by pretence whereof they wickedly defile themselues with the vncleannes of the diuell. He telleth vs againe of *eating the best flesh that can be gotten*, but we eate whether fish or flesh as lawes permit, what the prouidence of God doth yeeld vs, giuing God thankes, neither are we so scrupulous therein as he and his fellowes, who whether in fish or in flesh, being forsooth ghostly fathers, take it in scorne not to be entertained with the best. Whereas he mentioneth their almes, we finde it in former times which they bragge of, not to haue bene such, but [y] that in a time of dearth innumerable poore people haue died like dogs vpon dunghils, and in swine-sties, and in the streetes, without any compassion taken for their comfort and relieue. And no maruell, because almes was reduced by them to the maintenance of idle lozels in religious houses, as now it is to their night walking and wandering Circumcellions, but as for the true almes for the relieue of the poore and needy, we doubt not but it is more faithfully exercised by vs, then it was or is by them. Of racking poore men by fines and vnreasonable rents, he shall see examples enow amongst their Catacatholike disciples, of whom there be some, who for the colouring of their impious cruelties, do alledge concerning their tenants, liuing in due obedience to their Prince according to the lawes of God, that they are heretikes, and therefore that it skilleth not how they deale with them, not knowing that though their religion were the truth, yet it should concerne them which the Apostle saith; [z] *Whilest we haue time let vs do good to all mē, though specially to them that are of the houshold of faith.* Concerning *vsuries*, let him remember what *Mathew* of Paris reported of old concerning the Pope. [a] *The Pope*, saith he, *who should be the paterne and example of all religion, is an open vsurer.* He had here in England his bankers who were termed [b] *Caursini*, who did vse that trade of merchandise in his behalfe. Againe for craft and cosening, let him remember how the same *Mathew* describeth the Popes [c] *extortions cloked with arguments and reasons, his mousetrap-like deuices, his goodly words such as might moue harts of stōe, but that his*

x Rom. 4. 18.

y *Math. Paris in Hen 3. anno 1258. Deficiēte annona pauperū miserabiliter innumerabilis mortua est, & miserē sunt passim eorum corpora tumida præ fame & liuentia, quinā vel sena in porcarijs, sterquilinijs & lutosis plateis, &c*

z Gal. 6. 10.

a *Math. Paris in Henr. 3. anno 1247. Papa qui forma & exemplum totius teneretur esse religionis vsuarius est manifestus.*

b *Idem anno 1235. Caursini mercatores Papales.*

his deedes followed very clearely repugnant to humility and iust dealing. [d] *It seemed absurd*, saith he, *euen to simple men, to see by how diuers traps the Court of Rome craued nothing but gold and siluer, practised to rob the poore people of God of their substance.* Now therefore *M. Bishop* gaineth no credit to his doctrine of satisfactions, by charging these enormities vpon vs, inasmuch as they are found much more intolerably in the Pope himselfe, and therefore much more in them who are the members of so bad a head. Whosoeuer amongst vs doe sinne in these kindes, and cause the people of God to grieue, and his enemies to blaspheme his truth, wee teach them, and they shall find, that [e] *God is the auenger of such things*, and his iudgement shall in due time find out their sinne. Of the ridiculous absurdity of their *satisfactory prayers* I haue spoken before. His words of *bitter teares* are but formall; Catholike eies are too tender to be made red with bitter teares, and the form of their praiers fitteth not thereto. Our singing of *Geneua Psalmes*, as hee calleth them, indeede *Dauids* Psalmes, though many of them haply turned into English meeter at Geneua, is a deuotion prescribed by the holy Ghost, saying by the Apostle, [f] *Let the word of Christ dwell in you plenteously, in all wisdome, teaching and admonishing your owne selues in Psalmes, and Hymnes, and spirituall songs, singing with a grace in your hearts to the Lord.* If being merry in good sort we thus sing Psalmes, we therein follow the rule of *S. Iames*, [g] *Is any man merry? let him sing.* Yea and we hold it for a notable token of the apostasie of the Church of Rome, that it hath so abandoned this point of Christian exercise and deuotion, from all both publike and priuate vse. We do not *raile*, but performe the office of careful pastours and teachers in noting *their sinnes and errors not imagined* only, but verie sensible, not onely *pretended*, but proued by the testimony of him who is truth, and cannot erre. As for that which he saith of *laying all paine and sorrow vpon Christs shoulders*, it is true that we do so indeed, as touching satisfaction for sinne, but otherwise God wanteth not meanes to lay paines and sorrows vpon those that are his, to make them know that they are not *borne to pleasure and pastime*, but to [h] *serue the counsell of God*, & to glorifie his name. The Church of Rome swarmeth, as before hath beene noted, with Atheists and Epicures, that carry the shew of that perswasion, but amongst the true professors of the Gospell, there are no such found.

Finis.

c Anno 1234. *Argentorati ob exactiones extortiones excogitans. Excogitata multiplicatione pecuniæ emungere edoctus. Verba elegantissima quæ corda hominum lapidea viderentur penetrare, nisi facta humilitatis ac iustitiæ luce clarius aduersaria sequerentur.*

d Anno 1240. *Absurdum videbatur etiam simplicibus quàm diuersis muscipulis simplicē Dei populum subsiant in fine mundi rebantur. Romana curia priuare, nihil petens nisi aurum & argentum.*

e 1. Thess. 4. 6.

f Col. 3. 16.

g Iames 5. 13.

h Acts 13. 36.

# THE SECOND PART OF THE DEFENCE OF THE REFORMED CATHOLICKE.

Wherein the Religion eſtabliſhed in our Church of England (for the points here handled) is apparently iuſtified by authoritie of Scripture, & teſtimonie of the ancient church, againſt the vaine cauillations collected by Doctor *Biſhop* Seminary Prieſt, as out of other Popiſh writers, ſo ſpecially out of *Bellarmin*, & publiſhed vnder the name of *The marrow and pith of many large volumes*, for the oppugning thereof.

*By* ROBERT ABBOT *Doctor of Diuinitie.*

Tertul. de præſcript. aduer. hæret.
*Hæreſes de quorundam infirmitatibus habent quod valent, nihil valentes ſi in benè valentem fidem incurrant.*

*LONDINI*,
Impenſis Thomæ Adams.
1611.

Becauſe we ſee not nor vnderſtand Gods cõming to vs or departing frõ vs. Wherupõ he inferreth, *which is ſufficient to make a man thãkful: yea though he receiued no grace, yet were hee beholding to God who offred him his grace, & wold haue freely beſtowed it on him, if it had not bin through his owne default.* Now what is that that is ſufficient to make the man thãkful? that he knoweth not his own repẽtãce? that he neither ſeeth nor vnderſtãdeth Gods cõming to him nor departing frõ him? If gods viſitatiõ be not perceiued nor vnderſtood, what thãks can there be or conuiction of vnthãkfulnes? Doth a man thank God & not know for what, or whether there be any thing or not to thãk him for? how doth he know any default in this caſe, or cã ſay that God offered him any grace, or that he wold freely haue beſtowed the ſame vpõ him? Out of doubt his wits were a woolgathering whẽ he wrot this, or elſe his hãd outrã his head; yet haply he thoght it good enough for them to whõ he ment it, who muſt think of their ghoſtly father that he ſpeaks moſt lernedly whẽ they vnderſtãd him leaſt. But let me anſwer him to the place, that indeed we ſe not God, nor perceiue him cõming to vs, or departing frõ vs, but yet we feel him working in vs, & as *Bernard* noteth by the alteratiõ that we find in our ſelues, take occaſiõ to ſay [a] *Hæc eſt mutatio dexteræ excelſi: This chãge cometh of the right hãd of the moſt high:* Of this viſitatiõ *Cypriã* ſpeaks moſt fitly for our purpoſe [b] *As the lightning breketh the clouds, & the ſuddẽ ſhining therof doth not ſo much enlighte as dul the eie, ſo ſõtimes thou art touched with I know not what motiõ & feeleſt thy ſelf to be touched, & yet ſeeſt not him that toucheth thee. There are inwardly ſpokẽ to thee certaine ſecret words, which thou art not able to vtter; ſo as that thou cãſt not doubt but that he is neer thee, ye euẽ within thee which doth ſolicit thee, & yet doth not yeeld thee to ſee him as he is.* Which words plainly ſhew, that though a mã ſee not God either cõming or departing, yet he certainly knoweth & perceiueth in himſelfe the work of God. Therefore of the very words which *M. B.* cites *Hier.* ſaith; *that [c] the preſẽce of God cõming to a man is whẽ he becõmeth known to him, & his hiding of himſelf is termed the abſẽce of him as going away;* in neither of which we are able ſufficiẽtly to cõceiue or cõprehẽd him. Wherby we may ſee with how great diſcretiõ this place was broght to proue that gods work in mãs repẽtãce, is not certainly known to him. Now therfore the word of God is warrãt to a faithfulmã to aſſure himſelf of his ſaluatiõ. For it bidden him to [d] *beleeue the Goſpel*, & the goſpel is, that [e] *whoſoeuer beleeueth in Ch. ſhal haue euerlaſting life:* he is therfore to beleeue, that whoſoeuer beleeueth in Chriſt ſhal haue euerlaſting life. He is therfore to beleeue of

a Bernard.

b Cypr. Prolog de cardinalibus Chriſti operibus. Quomodo fulgur nubes diſrumpit & repentina conſpicatio non tam illuminat quàm hebetat oculum, ſi aliquãdo neſcio quo motu tangeris & tangi te ſentis, eſt tamen qui te tangit non intuetur. Dicuntur tibi quædam verba arcana in tui ſenſus quæ efferre non ſufficis, vt dubitare non poſſis, quia iuxta te eſt imò intra te qui te ſolicitat, nec tamen ſicuti eſt ſe tibi videndam concedit.

c Hieron. in Iob. cap. 9. Dicit quod venientis Dei preſentia ſit quando homini innoteſcat & quando occultatur quaſi abeuntis abſentia indicatur.

d Mar. 1. 15.

e Ioh. 3. 15. 16.

of himſelfe, that becauſe hee beleeueth in Chriſt hee ſhall haue euerlaſting life. Or if hee doe not beleeue of himſelfe, beleeuing in Chriſt that he ſhall haue euerlaſting life, he beleeueth not the Goſpell, that *whoſoeuer beleeueth in Chriſt ſhall haue euerlaſting life.* And thus the ſtrength of *M. Biſhops* argument is verie feeble, neither is it onely vaine in it ſelfe, but hee hath dealt as abſurdly in the handling of it.

3. W. BISHOP.

*The ſecond is. It is no article of the Creed, that a man muſt beleeue his owne Saluation, and therefore no man is bound thereunto.*

M. Perkins *anſwereth.* That euerie article of the Creed containes this particular faith of our owne Saluation, namely three: Firſt (*ſaith hee*) to beleeue in God, is to beleeue that God is our God, and to put our truſt in him for our Saluation.

Anſwer. *I admit all this, and adde more* (*that* M. Perkins *bee no longer ignorant of the Catholike knowledge of the Creed*) *that wee muſt alſo loue him with all our heart and ſtrength: thus wee vnderſtand it more fully then hee: Yet finde not out that thirteenth article,* Thou muſt beleeue thine owne particular Saluation. *For albeit, I beleeue and truſt in God, yet not beeing ſure of my loue towards him, I am not aſſured of Saluation, for as* S. Iohn *teſtifieth,* Hee that loueth not, abideth in death. 1. Iohn. 3.

*So I anſwer to the ſecond article named by* M. Perkins, *that is, I beleeue that God of his infinite mercy, through the merits of Chriſts paſſion, doth pardon all thoſe, who beeing heartilie ſorie for their ſinnes, do humblie confeſſe them, and fullie purpoſe to leade a new life: that I my ſelfe am ſuch a one, I doverily hope, becauſe I haue as farre forth as I could, to my knowledge performed thoſe things which God requires of mee, but becauſe I am but a fraile creature, and may perhaps not haue done all that ſo well as I ought, or am not ſo well aſſured of that, which by Gods helpe I haue done, I cannot beleeue it, for in matter of faith (as you ſhall heare ſhortly) there can be no feare or doubt.*

*The like anſwer is giuen to the article of life euerlaſting. I beleeue that I ſhal haue life euerlaſting, if I fulfil that which our Sauiour taught* Mat. 19. *the young man, demanding what hee muſt doe to haue life euerlaſting: to witte, if I keepe all Gods commandements, but becauſe I am not aſſured that I ſhall doe ſo (yea the Proteſtants (though falſly) aſſure vs, that no man by any helpe of Gods grace can ſo doe,) I remaine in feare.*

*But (ſaith* M. Perkins) *the diuell may ſo beleeue the articicles of the Creed, vnleſſe we do apply thoſe articles to our ſelues. Firſt, I ſay the diuell knowes to be true all that we do beleeue, and therefore are ſaid by S. Iames to beleeue, but they want a neceſſarie condition of faith, that is a godly and deuout ſubmiſſion of their vnderſtanding vnto the obedience of faith, and ſo haue no faith to ſpeake properly. Againe, they truſt not in God for Saluation, nor indeauour not any manner of way to obtaine Saluation, as Chriſtians doe, and ſo there is great difference betweene their beleefe in the articles of the Creed, and ours.*

R. ABBOT.

To this argument *M. Perkins* iuſtlie ſaith, that the pillars of the Church of Rome doe not vnderſtand the Creed, who hauing corrupted all points of Chriſtian faith, muſt needes frame the articles of the Creed to the ſame corruption. Whether they were the Apoſtles or other after them, that layed together this brieſe of faith, they intended not therein a narration of common hiſtorie, but a profeſſion of priuat hope. And that may appeare by the phraſe wherein they haue expreſſed this beleefe; I BELEEVE IN GOD THE FATHER; I BELEEVE IN IESVS CHRIST; I BELEEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST. For well doth *M. Perkins* note, that to ſay, *I beleeue in God*, is all one, as to ſay, I beleeue that God is my God; and I haue an aſſured confidence and truſt in him to be ſaued by his mercie. *M. Biſhop* mentioneth the anſwer in ſuperficiall and generall termes, that to beleeue in God is to beleeue that God is our God, and to put our truſt in him for our Saluation, and in this ſort admitteth it, but to that purpoſe as *M. Perkins* ſpake it, hee will by no meanes admit it, becauſe ſo to admit it, ſhould be to grant the point in queſtion. He can bee content that we in common beleeue God to be *our God* by right of ſoueraignty and authority, but he will not endure that any man ſhall ſay as *M. Perkins* intended, I beleeue that God is *my God*, by affection of loue. He will like well enough that wee put our truſt in him for our Saluation, ſo as to looke to be ſaued by him if wee bee ſaued, and haply to carry ſome probable opinion that we ſhall bee ſaued, but in no caſe will ſuffer vs to conceiue ſo of our ſelues, as to ſay with the Apoſtle, [a] *God hath not appointed vs to wrath, but to obtaine*

a 1. Theſ. 5. 9.

*taine Saluation by the meanes of Ieſus*: as *M. Perkins* meant. To beleeue that God is our God, is to beleeue that he is our life, our peace, our ſtrength, our deliuerance and Saluation; not only that he is theſe things in himſelfe, but that he is indeed the ſame to vs, aſſuredly perſwading our ſelues, that becauſe God is ours, therefore whatſoeuer is his is ours, that is, for vs and for our vſe, his mercie, his power, his prouidence, to watch ouer vs, and to preſerue and keepe vs to himſelfe both in life and death. This did God import when by his new couenant he bound himſelfe to his heires of promiſe, ſaying, [b] *I will be their God, and they ſhall be my people*, whereupon they ſhall bee imboldned to ſay, [c] *Lo this is our God, we haue waited for him, and he will ſaue vs; we will reioyce and bee ioyfull in his ſaluation.* And thus doth S. *Auſtin* teach vs to make [d] *God our God, to make him our poſſeſſion*, as he ſpeaketh, and therefore *without doubting to ſay vnto God, Thou art my God, becauſe hee ſaith to our ſoule, I am thy ſaluation.* And indeed no man can with a true heart ſay vnto God, *Thou art my God*, whoſe ſoule doth not with inward comfort heare God ſaying vnto him by his word, *I am thy ſaluation.* Seeing therefore that *M. Biſhop* cannot deny, but that to ſay, *I beleeue in God*, is as much as to ſay, I beleeue that God is my God, he muſt grant, that for a man to profeſſe to beleeue in God, is to profeſſe the aſſured beleefe of his owne ſaluation. The firſt degree of faith is *credere Deum, to beleeue that God is.* The ſecond degree is *credere Deo, to beleeue God*, that is, to beleeue that his words and promiſes are true. But *credere in deum, to beleeue in God*, addeth further to truſt in God according to that word and promiſe, and to beleeue the ſame, not onely generally and indefinitely, but particularly and to his owne vſe, firmely reſoluing that God will do to him according to that that he hath promiſed, and therefore to his repentance and faith, according to his promiſe will giue euerlaſting life. Thus *Euſebius Emiſenus* diſtinguiſhing thoſe phraſes rightly, ſaith, that [e] *no man is approued to haue beleeued in God, but hee that hath deuoutly truſted in him*, which is that that the Prophet *Dauid* nameth, *to put truſt in his mercie*, whereby we ſtedfaſtly expect at his hands, and of his meere goodneſſe, to receiue all things for our ſafety and Saluation. But *M. Biſhop* making ſhew to admit that which *M. Perkins*

b Jerem. 31. 33.
c Eſa. 25. 9.
d *Auguſt. in Pſa.* 32. *conc.* 2. *An temerè dicimus faciendo nobis Deum poſſeſſionem? &c. Ducat anima, ſecura dicat, Deus meus es tu, qui dicit animæ noſtræ, ſalus tua ego ſum, &c.*
e *Euſeb. Emiſ. ſen. de ſymb. hom.* 2.

*kins* ſaith, addeth more *that he might not be ignorant of the Catholike knowledge of the Creede, that we muſt alſo loue God with all our heart and ſtrength, and thus* ſaith that *they vnderſtand it more fully then we do*. Where we may obſerue what a wiſe conſtruction he maketh for himſelfe. For he telleth vs by and by that he is not ſure whether he loue God or not, and afterward againe that *charitie is ſeated in the darke corner of the will*, and a man cannot be ſure that it is in himſelfe. So then becauſe to beleeue in God, is to loue God with all his heart and ſtrength, and *M. Biſhop* doth not know whether he loue God or not, it muſt needs follow that for ought he knoweth, he doth but lie ſo often as he ſaith, *I beleeue in God*. This doth he gaine by his vnderſtanding this point more fully then we do. But we reſpect not here any largeneſſe or fulneſſe, but rather proprietie of vnderſtanding. It is true in deed that Saint *Auſtin* ſometimes declareth *beleeuing in God* by the loue of God, and other ſuch ſignes and tokens thereof, not as properly to define what it is to *beleeue in God*, but rather to ſhew who they are that truely doe beleeue in GOD, that men may not flatter themſelues with opinion of beleeuing, when indeed they doe not beleeue. Thus doth hee ſay, that [f] *to beleeue in God is to cleaue vnto God, to worke well with him, working that that is good in vs*; that [g] *he that beleeueth in Chriſt both hopeth in Chriſt and loueth Chriſt*; that [h] *to beleeue in Chriſt, is in beleeuing to affect, in beleeuing to loue Chriſt*. But it is one thing to deſcribe a thing by adioyned properties and effects, another thing to define it out of the nature and propriety of it ſelfe. Wee doubt not but that faith and loue are alwaies conioined, and true beleefe in God doth alwaies infallibly bring forth the loue of God, but yet as diuers members of the body neceſſarily concurring for the perfecting of the whole, haue euery one their ſeuerall office, the eye to ſee, the eare to heare, &c. ſo theſe vertues of the ſoule, namely faith and loue, though they alwaies meete and neuer are diuided, yet in office and act are diſtinct each from other, neither is to beleeue the ſame as to loue, nor to loue the ſame as to beleeue. For wee do not make the queſtion that Chriſt asked the man that had beene blind, [i] *Beleeueſt thou in the Sonne of God*; to be the ſame with that that he demaunded of *Peter*, [k] *Loueſt thou mee*? Now therefore to *beleeue in God*, is in it ſelfe to haue a full

f *Auguſt. in Pſal. 77. Adhærere ad benè cooperandum bona operanti Deo.*
g *De verb. dom. ſer. 61. Ille credit in Chriſtū qui & ſperat in Chriſtū & diligit Chriſtū.*
h *In Ioan. tract. 29. Quid eſt credere in eum? Credendo amare, credendo diligere, &c.*
i Iohn. 9. 35.
k Cap. 21. 15.

full affiance and assured trust in him that he will saue vs, and accordingly the summe of that that I professe to beleeue in the Creed is that God is my God and father by the mediation of Jesus Christ, through the sanctification of the holy Ghost, whereby hee hath made me a member of his Catholike Church, which is the communion and society of his Saints, to which, and all the members whereof, and so namely to me, he will giue remission and forgiuenesse of sinnes, and a happy resurrection of the body, to be partaker with the soule of euerlasting life. And that this is a matter of beliefe without any thirteenth article of the Creed, let him learne of *Dauid* saying,[l] *I beleeue to see the goodnesse of the Lord in the land of the liuing*. Which what is it else but to say, *I beleeue mine owne Saluatiō*? And let him learn of *Fulgentius*, that it was not proper to *Dauid* only to say so; for[m] *the iust liuing by faith*, saith he, *boldly saith, I beleeue to see the goodnes of the Lord in the land of the liuing*. Let *S. Austin* also teach him this matter of beleef: [n] *God hath promised thee, O man, that thou shalt liue for euer. Dost thou not beleeue it? Beleeue it, beleeue it; for that that he hath already done for thee, is a greater matter then that that he had promised*. To the same effect *Cyprian* speaketh, [o] *God hath promised vnto thee when thou departest out of this world, immortality and eternity, and doest thou doubt thereof? This were not to know God: this is to offend Christ the maister of beleeuers with the sinne of vnbeleefe? this is for a man being in the house of faith to be without faith*. So that by *Cyprians* iudgement to haue faith, is for a man to beleeue his owne Saluation, and not to beleeue his owne Saluation, is to bee without faith. But Saint *Bernerd* handleth this point most pregnantly of all other. [p] *It is necessarie for the to beleeue, that thou canst not haue forgiuenesse of sinnes but by the mercie of God, and that by no works thou canst obtaine eternall life, vnlesse it also be giuen thee. But these things are not sufficient, nay they are to bee accounted but the beginning and as it were the foundation of faith. Therefore if thou beleeuest that thy sinnes cannot bee put away, but by him to whom onely thou hast*

l Psal. 27. 13.

m Fulgent. ad Monim. lib. 1. Iustus ex fide viuens fiducialiter dicit, Credo videre bona Domini, &c.

n Augustin. Psal. 148. Deus tibi promisit Deus o homo mortalis? Quia victurus es in æternum. Non credis? Crede: Plus est id quod fecit quia quod promisit.

o Cyprian. de mortalit. Deus tibi de hoc mundo recedenti immortalitatem pollicetur atque æternitatē, & tu dubitas? hoc est Deum omnino non nosse, hoc est Christū credentiū magistrum peccato incredulitatis offendere: hoc est in ecclesia constitutum fidem in domo fidei non habere.

p Bernard. in Annunciat. ser. 1. Necesse est primo omnium credere quod remissionem peccatorum habere non possis nisi per indulgentiam Dei, &c. postremò quòd æternam vitam nullis potes operibus promereri nisi gratis detur & illa, &c. Verum hæc non omnino sufficiunt sed magis initium quoddam & velut fundamentum fidei sunt habenda. Idcoque si credis peccata tua non posse deleri nisi abeo cui soli peccasti bene facis; sed adde adhuc et & hoc credas quia per ipsum tibi peccata donantur. Hoc est testimonium quod perhibet in corde nostro Spir. sanctus dicens, Dimissa sunt tibi peccata tua. Sic enim arbitratur Apostolus gratis iustificari hominem per fidem. Sic & de vita æterna habeas necesse est testimonium spiritus quod ad eam sis diuino munere peruenturus.

sinned

*ſinned thou doeſt well, but adde hereto to beleeue,* THAT BY HIM THY SINNES ARE FORGIVEN THEE. *This is the teſtimony that the holy Ghoſt giueth in our heart, ſaying, Thy ſinnes are forgiuen thee: for thus doth the Apoſtle define, that a man is freely iuſtified by faith. So alſo as touching eternall life, it is needfull that thou haue the teſtimony or witneſſe of the ſpirit,* THAT THOV SHALT COME VNTO IT BY THE GIFT OF GOD. Heere then it is plaine, that without any thirteenth article of the Creed, the faith whereby the Apoſtle ſaith a man is iuſtified, is ſuch a faith as whereby I beleeue mine owne Saluation; whereby I beleeue that my ſinnes are forgiuen me, and that I ſhall attaine by the very gift of God vnto euerlaſting life. But ſaith *M. Biſhop, I beleeue and truſt in God; Yet not being ſure of my loue towards him, I am not aſſured of Saluation.* Where hee plainly ſheweth, that hee hath no loue towards God, becauſe where loue is, it cannot but be certainely felt and known, and if he loued God, hee could not but aſſure himſelfe thereof. Now therfore it is no maruell, that hee hath no aſſurance of ſaluation, when there wanteth in him the certaine and infallible effect of that faith whereby he ſhould be aſſured of Saluation. For true faith is the fountaine of our loue towards God, whileſt beleeuing God to bee ſuch and ſo merciſull vnto vs, it ſwalloweth vp our affections, and draweth our loue and deuotion vnto him. Which is not vnfelt in vs, but by the feeling thereof in our ſelues, we gather a further confirmation and aſſurance to our ſelues, that we are beloued of God. Both which *S. Bernard* well declareth, ſaying of the faithfull man: [q] *A vile worme and worthy to be hated euerlaſtingly, yet aſſureth himſelfe that he is beloued, becauſe he feeleth himſelfe to loue; nay becauſe he firſt feeleth himſelfe to be beloued, therefore he is aſhamed not to loue againe.* So againe he ſaith that [r] *the loue of God breedeth in the ſoule loue towards God, and by feeling it ſelfe to loue, it is alſo out of doubt that it ſelfe is beloued.* Now what a miſerable caſe is *M. Biſhop* in, that neither is ſure of his loue towards God, nor dare aſſure himſelfe of Gods loue towards him? If he had not a ſenſeleſſe and dead heart, he could not but much grieue and lament at his owne eſtate. And yet forſooth he telleth vs, that *he doth beleeue and truſt in God*; but therein he lieth vnto God. For [t] *he doth not beleeue in God, that doth not place the confidence of his felicity in God only*; which he doth not place in God onely, but partly in God and partly in himſelfe.

q *Bernard. epiſt. 107. Vermis vilaſſimus & odio digniſſimus ſempiterno, tamen confidit amari, quia ſentit amare, imò quia ſe amari præſentit non reamare confunditur.*

r *Idem in Cant. ſer. 69. Amor Dei amorem animæ parit. &c. Ex eo quòd ſe diligere ſentit etiã diligi non ambigit.*

s *Cyprian. de duplici martyr. Non credit in deũ qui non in eo ſo'o collocat totius felicitatis ſuæ fiduciam.*

Hee

Hee doth not truſt in God, that doth not rely wholy vpon Gods mercy, and thereby looke for that at his hands for which hee truſteth in him, ſo as to account himſelfe deceiued by him if he faile thereof, which neuer hath befallen to any, nor ſhall befall that doth put his truſt in God. *M. Biſhop* diuideth this truſt betwixt God and himſelfe, and ſo truſteth in God, as that he maketh that for which he profeſſeth to truſt in God, to hang chiefly vpon himſelfe, and therefore no maruell if he haue no aſſurance of Saluation, becauſe he incurreth rather the curſe denounced by the Propher, [t] *Curſed is the man that truſteth in man, and maketh fleſh his arme.* For what doth he elſe when he leaueth the whole work of God, as wee haue heard before, to be confirmed and made good by his own *free will?* Now as touching that other article of beleeuing in Chriſt, to haue by his merits remiſſion of ſinnes, *S. Auſtin* teacheth vs, that [u] *to beleeue in Chriſt is to be vnited vnto Chriſt, to be made one with him, to be incorporated, to be members of his body.* He expoundeth it to be all one with that which Chriſt ſaith in the Goſpell, of [x] *eating his fleſh & drinking his bloud*, which whoſoeuer doth, [y] *dwelleth in Chriſt and Chriſt in him, he hath eternall life, and Chriſt will raiſe him vp at the laſt day.* Thus the Goſpell of Chriſt inſtructeth vs, and hee that beleeueth in Chriſt, becauſe he beleeueth the Goſpell, muſt beleeue that he is a member of Chriſt, one with Chriſt and Chriſt with him; that he dwelleth in Chriſt, and Chriſt in him, that Chriſt hath giuen vnto him eternall life, and will raiſe him vp at the laſt day; being aſſured, that as a head wil not ſuffer a member of it owne body to periſh, which it hath in his power to preſerue; ſo Chriſt hauing made him a member of his body, and hauing power to ſaue him, will not ſuffer him to periſh, but as a faithfull Mediatour will performe that charge, which [z] *the will of the heauenly father* hath laid vpon him, *that of all that he hath giuen him he ſhould looſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it vp at the laſt day.* Now *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that *he beleeueth that God for the merits of Chriſts paſſion, doth forgiue them that are heartily ſorie for their ſinnes, and humblie confeſſe them, with a full purpoſe of a new life. And this he hopeth that he hath done, but he cannot aſſure himſelf that he hath done it, or that he hath done it ſo well as he ought to do, and therefore cannot beleeue the forgiueneſſe of his ſinnes.* Where we ſee, that the merits of Chriſts paſſion is not ſufficient in his opinion, to purchaſe for him the forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, but it muſt further

t Ierem. 17. 5.

u *Auguſt. in Ioan. tract. 29. & de verb. dom. ſer. 61. Credendo in eum ire & membras eius incorporari. &c. Quoquo modo vnitur in eum & membrum in corpore eius efficitur.*

x *Idem in Ioan. tract. 26. Credere in Chriſtum, hoc eſt manducare panem viuum.*

y Iohn. 6. 54. 56.

z Iohn. 6. 39.

there hang vpon the ſufficiencie and perfection of his owne repentance. It is not enough that he trulie repent, vnleſſe he repent *ſo well as hee ought to do*, that his repentance may deſerue the pardon that he ſeeketh for. But we for our parts know and confeſſe, that our repentance, our faith, our righteouſneſſe, are neuer ſuch *as they ought to bee*: we are ſhort and vnperfect in the ſorrow for our ſinnes; our purpoſes of newe life and amendment of our defaults, proue often times like [a] *the morning dew* that is quickly dried vp. And therfore it is not the value and woorth of our repentance that we reſt vpon to merite pardon and forgiueneſſe, but wee require a ſinceritie and truth thereof, faithfully to craue the ſame, beeing but as the paine and griefe which maketh to ſeek the medicine whereby it is eaſed; as the hunger and thirſt which maketh to craue the foode whereby it is releeued; as the feeling of beggerie and want, which maketh to ſeeke the treaſure and riches by which it is ſupplied. Which ſupplie and releeſe ſpiritually we find in this, that [b] *we are iuſtified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Chriſt Ieſus, whom God hath ſet foorth to be an attonement for vs* (not by the merit of our repentance) but *by faith in his bloud*. [c] *Freelie, for god a mercy, for nothing*, as the Rhemiſts expound the word *gratis*, willing to ſhew a little truth in giuing the right ſignification of the word, but craftilie ſuppreſſing the ſame truth, and plainly contradicting it by a colourable gloſſe deuiſed againſt the text of the Apoſtle, and againſt the ſignification of the word, which force of truth hath wreſted from themſelues. [d] *Freely*, ſaith *Ambroſe, becauſe hauing no workes, nor yeelding any requitall euen of the gift of God, we are iuſtified by faith onely*. [e] *Freely*, ſaith *Chryſoſtome, becauſe he vſeth heereto no workes of ours, but requireth faith onely*. And he requireth *faith only*, onely as a hand whereby wee receiue, not as a worke whereby wee deſerue this forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes, that ſo the true penitent may firmely expect it in Chriſt onely by beleeuing, not hang in ſuſpence of it by beeing in doubt of vnſufficiencie in repenting; God hauing therefore appointed it to be [f] *by faith that it may bee of grace, that the promiſe* (thereof) *may bee ſure* (not in it ſelfe, not with God; who doubteth but in that reſpect it is ſure enough? but) *to all the ſeede*, that is, to euerie one that beleeueth; the promiſe beeing *that* [g] *through the name of Chriſt, euerie one that beleeueth in him ſhall haue forgiueneſſe of ſinnes*. Which faith, though it bee yet but weake and little

[a] Oſe.6.4

[b] Rom 3.24.

[c] *Rhem Teſtam. Explicat. of certaine words: in the end.*

[d] *Ambr. in Rom. cap.3. Gratis quia nihil operantes, neque vicem reddentes ſola fide iuſtificati ſunt dono Dei.*

[e] *Chryſ. in Rom. hom.7. Nullis ad hoc vſus operibus ſed fidem tantum exigens.*

[f] Rom.4.16.

[g] Act.10.43.

little, and ſometimes interrupted with feares and doubts, yet God accepteth it and cheriſheth it, that by more experience it may grow to more ſtrength, neither is it true which *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that in matter of faith there is no feare or doubt, as anon after ſhall appeare. In the meane time he further addeth as touching the article of *Eternall life*, that *he beleeueth he ſhall haue it, if he ſhall keepe all Gods commandements, but becauſe he is not aſſured that he ſhall ſo do, he remaineth in feare.* And very iuſtly may he be in feare that looketh for eternall life vpon no other condition then he doth. The Apoſtle indeed doth plainely debarre him from all hope and expectation thereof, when he ſaith[h] *So many as are of the workes of the law, are vnder the curſe, for it is written, Curſed is euery one that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the law to doe them.* Where he plainely taketh it for graunted, that no man continueth in all things that are written in the law, that is, that no man keepeth all Gods commandements, and therefore concludeth, that he that for eternall life dependeth vpon *keeping all Gods commandements*, cannot auoid the curſe. Yea, but Chriſt ſaith to the young man in the Goſpell, [i] *If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the commandements.* It is true; but Chriſt ſaith it to induce the young man to the knowledge of himſelfe, and very ill is it applied to ſeduce men from the true acknowledgement of the faith of Chriſt. The young man asketh *what he might do to inherit eternall life?* Our Sauiour Chriſt referreth him to the law, as [k] *the Schoolemaſter to traine him vnto Chriſt*, that finding it [l] *a thing impoſſible for the law to giue him life*, and therefore caſting off all vaine confidence of the righteouſneſſe thereof, hee might bee fitted to embrace [m] *the faith of that name, in which onely life* and *Saluation* is offred vnto vs. Which it plainlie appeareth this young man conceiued not, by reaſon of a preſumption that he had by miſunderſtanding the law, that he had obſerued the law. The vaine opinion wherof to diſcouer, our Sauiour biddeth him to ſell all & giue to the poore, promiſing him treaſure in heauen, and willing him in the meane time to come and follow him, that it might appeare how far he was frō that loue of God & his neighbour which the law required, in whoſe heart the loue of riches bare ſo great a ſway, as that he could not be content at Gods cōmandement vpō promiſe of heauenly treaſure, to beſtow the ſame to the neceſſity of his neighbour. Now if he had rightly eſteemed of, himſelfe

h Gal. 3. 10.

i Mat. 19. 17.

k Gal 3. 25.

l Rom. 3. 3. Gal. 3. 21.

m Acts. 4. 12.

himſelfe how farre he was from being anſwerable to the righteouſneſſe of the law, he would haue profited by the words of Chriſt, and haue taken occaſion thereby to come to Chriſt for the obtaining of eternall life, the true meanes whereof he directeth when he ſaith, u *This is life eternall, to know thee the onely true God, and Ieſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* Which knowledge of Chriſt ſeeing this man had not, without which *M. Biſhop* himſelfe I hope will ſay there is no eternall life, ſurely euen by his owne grounds it muſt be abſurd, to ſay that Chriſt by theſe words did ſimply intend to direct him a way for the obtaining of eternall life. And if he will ſay, that he was indeed firſt to beleeue, and then by faith to keepe the commandements, thereby to enter into life, the Apoſtle taketh exception againſt that, when citing the words of the Prophet, *The iuſt ſhall liue by faith*, he inferreth, o *Now the law is not of faith, but ſaith, Hee that doth theſe things ſhall liue in them.* For if the law ſaying, *He that doth theſe things, ſhall liue in them*, do not accord with the faith of Chriſt, then it is not for them to profeſſe the faith of Chriſt, *in the doing of theſe things*, that is, in the keeping of the commandements to expect the obtaining of eternall life. Yea, p *the grace of the Goſpell is made void if it bring Chriſt to the law*, ſaith *Tertullian*, which he learned of the Apoſtle, ſaying, q *Ye are voided of Chriſt, ye are fallen from grace that will be iuſtified by the law.* Therefore he ſaith: r *If they which bee of the law be heires, then faith is made void, and the promiſe is made of none effect*: s *If the inheritance bee by the law, it is no longer by promiſe. But God hath giuen it by promiſe*, and therfore faith beleeueth t *that God hath giuen vnto vs eternall life, and this life is* (not in our keeping the commandements but) *in his ſonne*, and in him only we are to expect it, that from the beginning to the end wee may ſtill confeſſe, that u *eternall life is the gift of God through Ieſus Chriſt our Lord.* The commandements of God therefore are now laid before vs, not as the condition for obtaining of eternall life, but as the way to walke in vnto eternall life, aſſured vnto vs by the free promiſe and gift of God. And of this promiſe and gift of God the keeping of Gods commandements is a part, who hath ſaid, x *I will put my law in their hearts, and in their minds will I write them*; y *I will put my ſpirit into them, and will cauſe them to walke in my ſtatutes, and to keep my iudgements and doe them.* Whereto agree the words of the Apoſtle, z *We are his workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Ieſus vnto good works, which God hath*

u John 17.3.
o Gal 3.11.
p Tertull. de præſcript. Euacuatur gratia Euangelica ſi ad legem Chriſtum redigit.
q Gal.5.4.
r Rom.4.14.
s Gal. 3.18.
t 1. Iohn 5.10.11
u Rom.6.23.
x Ierem.31.33.
y Ezech. 36.27.
z Ephe. 2.10.

*hath prepared for vs to walke in.* Which *workmanship* when by the grace of God it is begun in vs, albeit by reason of many imperfections it be not such, as that by the vertue thereof we may expect eternall life, yet our faith receiueth further confirmation and assurance thereby, that hee that hath wrought this beninning of life, will goe forward therewith to the end, and hauing made vs partakers of one part of his promise, will make vs also partakers of the other, taking these first fruits of sanctification, as an earnest and pledge from him of the performance of the whole. Therefore albeit wee well know, that we do not keep the cõmandements of God as we ought to doe, yet wee doe not for that cause stand in doubt of eternall life, but finding our hearts truly affected towards God, [a] *hungring and thirsting after righteousnesse*, vnfainedly hating sinne, and groning vnder the burden of it, [b] *hanging so fast on*, we comfort our selues, that God hath made the light of his Saluatiõ to shine vnto vs, resoluing according to his promise, that this Sunne-rising though it bee not yet fully cleere, and may haply sometimes be ouercast with clouds, yet shall neuer haue any night, but that excepting our godly indeauours, pardoning our defects and wants, forgiuing vs all our sinnes, hee will [c] *perfect the good worke which hee hath* so graciously *begun* in vs, so that the true faithfull soule may alwaies boldly say, [d] *Thy louing kindnesse and mercy, shall follow me all the dayes of my life, & I shal dwell in the house of the Lord for euer.* Now because *M. Bishop* laieth no other but a rotten foundation, no maruell if hee build no other but a tottering and shaking house, because hee looketh to haue life grow out of his keeping of the commandements, which is as a reed continually shaken with the wind, no maruell if hee denie to himselfe any stedfast assurance and trust of attaining thereunto. But yet it is a falshood of his to charge the Protestants with affirming, *that no man by any helpe of Gods grace can keep Gods commandements.* The Protestants onely say, that God giueth vs not that fulnesse of grace whilest heere we liue, as that we can fully and perfectly keepe the commandements of God so as to bee iustified thereby, but they deny not, but that all the faithfull according to the degrees and measure of grace receiued, doe in a measure keepe Gods commandements, and as grace is increased, so they increase in the keeping of the commandements, and that this grace shall yet further renew and sanctifie them, in such sort, as that in the end corruption & sin

[a] Mat.5.6.
[b] Heb.3.7.
[c] Phil.1.6.
[d] Psal.23.6.

beeing

beeing wholly abolished for euer, they shall be fullie conformed to that image of righteousnesse that God hath described in the lawe. But of this hereafter. In the meane time wee see by that that *M. Bishop* hath told vs of faith, that the Church of Rome indeed teacheth no other faith but the same that diuels haue. Which beeing obiected by *M. Perkins*, hee laboureth to cleare, but saith nothing to serue the turne, but by ouerthrowing that which he buildeth otherwhere. He saith, *that the diuels knowe all to be true which wee beleeue, but yet do want a necessarie condition of faith, which is a godly & deuout submission of their vnderstanding to the obedience of faith, and so haue no faith to speake properly.* But if *godly and deuout submission of the vnderstanding to the obedience of faith*, be a *necessarie condition of faith*, as hee telleth vs heere, so as that which is *called faith* without this is not *properlie so called*, how then standeth it which elsewhere he determineth, that faith truelie and properly so called, may be without *charity and good works*? For what *godlinesse*, what *deuotion*, what *submission or obedience* can there be where *charitie* is not? *Godlinesse, deuotion, submission, obedience*, what are they but *good workes*? If then faith properly so called, cannot bee without these, then it is true which wee say, that true faith can neuer bee without charitie and good workes. But that hee denieth in the other place, and with common consent they all denie it. Therefore he must denie that which heere he himselfe saith, that *godly and deuout submission of the vnderstanding to the obedience of faith, is a necessary condition of faith properly so called*, and so, as yet there is no exception but that their faith is the same with the diuels faith. But taking this which he saith, which indeed is true, though he by no meanes must stand to it, that *godly and deuout submission, &c.* is a *necessary condition of true faith*, yet because it is but a condition adioined, and not the verie nature of faith it selfe, surely vnlesse hee describe faith in other sort then hee doth, hee answereth yet nothing as touching the very act of faith, but that the faith of diuels is all one with their faith. His other exception is, that *the diuels trust not in God for Saluation, nor indeauour any manner of way to obtaine it as Christians do.* Which is euen as vaine as the former was, because hee answereth nothing to put difference as touching faith it selfe, he himselfe still denying that *trust in God for a mans owne Saluation*, is any part of faith. But he should haue answered directly to the point, what there is in the

very

, very nature of faith it ſelfe, whereby their faith is to bee diſtingui-
, ſhed from the faith of diuels, whereof he is not able to giue vs any certaine anſwer. And to be ſhort, all that hee hath here ſaid is but framed for a ſhew, to ſerue for preſent ſhift, becauſe hee dareth not deny but that there hath bin and are many deſperate rakehels (yea of their Popes and Cardinals there haue not wanted ſuch) in whom there is no *godly or deuout ſubmiſſion of vnderſtanding to the obedience of faith, no truſt in God for Saluation, no indeauour to obtaine it*, who yet haue had their Catholike faith, to beleeue that Chriſt hath died, and riſen againe, and that by his bloud there is forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, though not for them, yet for them that repent: ſo that in that which he ſaith hitherto, there is nothing at all whereby to put difference betwixt their faith & the diuels faith, and hereafter we ſhall ſee, that he is able to ſay no more then here he hath ſaid.

## 4. W. Bishop.

M. Perkins *in his firſt exception graunts*: That commonly men do Pag. 54.
, not beleeue their Saluation, as infallibly as they doe the articles of
, the faith (*yet ſaith he*) ſome ſpeciall men do.

*Whereof I inferre by his owne confeſſion, that our particular Saluation is not to be beleeued by faith, for whatſoeuer we beleeue by faith, is as infallible as the word of God, which aſſureth vs of it. Then if the common ſort of the faithfull do not beleeue their Saluation, to be as infallible as the articles of our Creed, yea as Gods owne word, they are not by faith aſſured of it. Now that ſome ſpeciall good men, either by reuelation from God, or by long exerciſe of a virtuous life, haue a great Certaintie of their Saluation, we willingly confeſſe: but that Certaintie doth rather belong to a well grounded hope, then to an ordinarie faith.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Perkins* rightly ſaith, that the Scriptures in this matter of faith & aſſurance, do direct vs the duty of faith, what it ought to do, and what we are to pray and labour for, though we do not all and alwaies attaine vnto it. Secondly, that though commonly men do not with the like aſſurance beleeue their owne Saluation, as they do the doctrine of faith expreſſed in the articles of the Creed, yet

d Ver. 1. the Psalme, [d] *Blessed is the man whose vnrighteousnesse is forgiuen, and whose sinne is couered: Blessed is he to whom the Lord imputeth no sinne,* as to note that one part of that blessing is to bee released from the temporall punishments that are due to sinne. Yea and to that purpose he addeth also after: [e] *For this,* that is, saith S. *Austin, for forgiuenes of sinnes, shal euery one that is godly make his prayer vnto thee in a time when thou maist bee found, surely in the ouerflowing of many waters they shall not come neere him.* Where by *many waters* he vnderstandeth the manifold crosses & afflictions of this life, wherwith we are tossed to and fro by reason of our sinnes, and signifieth that the godly man by obtaining forgiuenesse of sinnes, obtaineth deliuerance and freedom from the punishment thereof. Forgiuenesse of sins then is not vnderstood with reseruation of temporall satisfaction, neither doth any thing remaine in the nature of punishment to him that by repentance and faith becommeth partaker of that mercy. As for his distinction of *mortall and veniall* sinnes applyed to the petition of forgiuenes of sinnes, we know no such, neither is any such to be approued, as [f] before hath beene shewed. By Gods hearkening to our prayer all sinnes become veniall; if God heare not our prayer for forgiuenesse of sinnes, all sinnes continue mortall. Our Sauiour Christ knew no such difference as *M. Bishop* maketh, that God when he heareth vs crying vnto him, *Forgiue vs our trespasses,* doth forgiue vs some sinnes wholy, and other some but in part, or that our prayer should *bee a speciall meane* in some sinnes, *to obtaine pardon of the fault, and release of punishment,* and in other some not so. No, neither did *S. Austine* euer dreame, that God did forgiue sinnes with a reseruation of the punishment thereof: hee knew well that forgiuenesse altereth the case and nature of afflictions, as hath bene before shewed. *Maister Bishop* citeth him saying, that [g] *For the daily, short, and light offences, without which this life is not led, the daily prayer of the faithfull satisfieth.* But as he saith so of these daily and light offences, so he saith of other also in the next words: *It blotteth out also those from which the life of the faithfull wickedly led, but by repentance changed to better is departed, if as it is truly said, Forgiue vs our trespasses, so it be truely said, As we forgiue them that trespasse against vs, that is, if it bee done which is said.* So then as it *satisfieth* for the one, so it satisfieth for the other also: as for the lesser, so for the greater, and for both obtaineth

e Ver. 6. Aug. Pro hac. Pro qua hac? profecto venia peccatorum.

f Of iustification, Sect. 41.

g Aug. Enchir. cap. 71. De quotidianis, brevibus, leuibusq; peccatis sine quibus hac vita non ducitur, quo idonea oratio fidelium satisfacit &c. Delet omnino hec oratio minima & quotidiana peccata. Delet & alia à quibus vita fidelium scelerate etiam gesta sed pœnitentia in melius mutata discedit, si quemadmodum veraciter dicitur, Dimitte nobis, & cita veraciter dicatur sicut & nos, &c. id est, si fiat quod dicitur.

obtaineth pardon at Gods hands. But *Master Bishop* heere doth meerely abuse his Reader by an equiuocation of the name of *satisfaction*. For *Satisfaction* with Saint *Austine*, as with all the auncient Ecclesiasticall Writers, importeth the meanes whereby wee are to intreate and obtaine of God pardon and forgiuenesse of our sinnes: but with *Master Bishop* and his fellowes it importeth a punishment still remaining *for sinnes past, and already pardoned, to be endured either in this life, or after death in Purgatorie*, as he hath before expressed in the beginning of this Chapter. Saint *Austines* meaning then is, that the daily prayer of the faithfull sufficeth to obtaine pardon at Gods hands for our daily and common trespasses, yea and for greater offences also when by repentance and amendment of life we forsake them: but no meaning hath he either that the saying of the Lords prayer, should bee a recompence to God for our trespasse, or that our trespasse beeing pardoned, there should still remaine a satisfaction to bee performed for it. Now here *Master Bishop* further denieth, that in the Lords prayer we vse onely *plea of pardon: for* (saith he) *we are taught also to pardon others euen as we will looke to be pardoned*. And what then? what, because we are taught freely to pardon others, shall wee heereupon conceiue, that God is hired by our pardoning others to giue pardon vnto vs? Our Sauiour Christ noteth therby the affect of them to whom it belongeth to vse the plea of pardon: he saith not any thing to be construed to the impeachment and derogation of the freenesse of the pardon. Meekenesse and readinesse to forgiue, is [h] *a fruite of the spirit of adoption, by which we cry Abba Father*, in the voice of which spirit only it is, that God heareth vs vnto vs. [k] *It is for them to say, Our Father which art in heauen*, saith Saint *Austine*, *who now are regenerate and borne againe to such a Father of water and of the holy Ghost*. If we speake not by his spirit, our voice is as the voice of strangers, and God giueth no regard vnto it. Therefore our forgiuenesse of others is not alledged as the cause for which God is moued to forgiue vs, but we present it to him as the mark of his spirit, which he hath set vpon vs, & as the token that we are his childrē, to whō he hath assigned it for a portiō to be made partakers of the forgiuenes of sins, & to whō Christ hath ministred cōfort & boldnes so to pray. His 2. exception is very vaine also: for although the Lords praier contain not al things necessary to saluatiō, yet the

h Gal. 5. 22. 23.
i Rom. 8. 15.
k *Aug. Enchir. cap. 71. Eorum qui dicere Pater noster, & aquam tibi patris regeneratis fontem ex aqua & spiritu sanc. o.*

Lord

praier is the direction of all prayers necessary to saluation. Therefore *Tertullian* calleth it, as he in his manner speaketh, l *legitimam orationem, the prayer that serueth vs for a law of praying*: and *Austin* also saith: m *If thou go ouer all the words of holy prayer, thou shalt find nothing (as I thinke) which this Lords prayer containeth not.* Yea *Tertullian* doubted not further to affirme, that n *it is the breefe summe of the whole Gospell.* Now therefore if in the Lords prayer wee aske forgiuenesse of sinnes onely by plea of pardon, then it cannot bee that we should be taught elsewhere to aske forgiuenesse vpon tender of satisfaction, which wholly ouerthroweth the name and nature of forgiuenesse. And surely *M. Bishops* vnderstanding might affoord him to conceiue, that although the Lords prayer containe not all things necessary to saluation, yet that that is there contained, receiueth no checke from any thing spoken otherwhere. As for his last exception it is most absurd, that the prayer by which we intreate God not to vrge vs to satisfaction, should it selfe bee accounted a satisfaction, as if we said vnto God, Forgiue vs our trespasse, O Lord, and yet wee do not wish thee to forgiue vs altogether freely, and for nothing; for euen by our praying we make thee amends for our trespasse. Satisfaction is defined with them to be o a punishment, and because prayer as *M. Bishop* telleth vs, is *one part of satisfaction*, we must vnderstād that with them it is a punishment to pray, and *M. Bishop* hauing receiued the penitents confession, and inioyning him a number of *Pater nosters*, doth enioyne him so many punishments, and maketh him in effect to say vnto God againe, O Lord forgiue me my sinnes, and that I may deserue that fauour at thy hands, I here make thee satisfaction and recompence, by enduring this punishment of praying to thee. Nay, it is scant so well: I pray thee, gentle Reader, to marke well the contriuing of this matter. The penitent commeth to *M. Bishop*, who vpon his confession giueth him absolution of all his sins, enioyning him for satisfaction and penance thus and thus to pray. So then he saith, O Lord, my sins, be forgiuen me already, but yet for a punishment, and by way of satisfaction I say vnto thee, Forgiue vs our trespasses. These are the mysteries of the fornications of the whore of Babylon, things reasonlesse, witlesse, senselesse, meer witcheries & enchantments of mens minds, such as the very common instinct of Christianitie should teach all men to detest; to discouer them, is sufficient

l *Tertul. de fug. in persecut. & li. de Orat.*
m *August. Epi. 121. cap. 12. Si per omnia precationū sanctarum verba discurras, quantū existimo nihil inuenies quod non ista dominica contineat & concludat oratio.*
n *Tertul. de Ora. Breuiarium totius Euangelij.*
o *Thom. Aquin. Supp. q. 15. art. 15 in corp. Opus satisfactorium opponit: quod sit pœnale.*

ficient to confute them. But of this *M. Bishop* telleth vs wee shall heere more hereafter.

## 7. W. BISHOP.

M. Perkins *fourth Argument is taken out of certain odde fragments of auncient writers.*

Guiltines being taken away, the punishment is also taken away. Tertul. de Bapt.

*True: he that is guilty of nothing, cannot iustly be punished: for guiltines is a binding vp to punishment (as* M. Perkins *defineth,) then if the band to punishment be cancelled, the party is freed: but all this is nothing to the purpose, for guiltines of temporal punishment doth remaine after the sin and guilt of eternall be released.* Pag. 18.

Augustine *saith*, Christ by taking vpon him the punishment, and not the fault, hath done away both fault and punishment. *Iust: the eternall punishment which was due to that fault, not the temporal:* De verb. Apost. ser. 37.

*as* S. Augustine *himselfe declareth*: God of compassion doth blot out our sinnes committed, if conuenient satisfaction be not on our parts neglected. In Enchir. cap. 70.

*To that other sentence out of him:* When wee are gone out of this world, there will remaine no compunction or satisfaction, *it is easie to answer without the helpe of any new edition: for it will be too late then to repent, and so there is no place left to compunction, that is, contrition of heart: neither consequently to confession or satisfaction: as if hee had said, before wee go out of this world there is place for both compunction and satisfaction and so that place is rather for vs.*

*Now* to Chrysostome, *who saith*, That God so blotteth out our sins, that there remaines no print of them: which thing befals not the body: for when it is healed, there remaineth a scarre; but when God exempteth from punishment, hee giues thee iustice. *All this is most true, and much against* M. Perkins *doctrine of the infection of originall sin, but nothing touching satisfaction: for we hold, that the soul of a sinner when he commeth to be iustified, is washed whiter then snow: so that there is no staine or print left in it of the filth of sin. It also freed frō all eternall punishment, but not from some temporall. Now gentle Reader, prepare thy self to behold a proper peece of cosinage.* Ambrose *saith* I reade of Peters teares, but I reade not of his satisfaction. Tom. 10. hom. 5. Prem in Esa. Luk. 22.

*lour of the craft lieth in the ambiguity of this word*, satisfaction, *which is not alwaies taken for the pennãce done to satisfie for the former fault, but is sometimes vsed for the defence and excuse of the fact. So speaketh*
Act. 24. 10. S. Paul, Bono animo pro me satisfaciam, *with good courage I will an-*
1. Pet. 3. *swer in defence of my self, or giue you satisfaction: in like maner*, Ready alwaies to satisfie euery one that asketh you reason of that hope which is in you. *In this sence doth S* Ambrose *vse the word, as is most plainly to be seene to them that read the place and confer it with the ve-*
Lib. 10. in Luc. *ry like of his*, I find not (*saith he*) what *Peter* said, but I find that he wept: I reade his teares, but I reade not his satisfaction: but that which cannot be defended, may be washed away. *So that nothing is more manifest, then that satisfaction in this and the like places is take for defence and excuse of his fault, which* Peter *vsed not, but sought by teares and bitter weeping to satisfie in part for it: for this bewailing of our sinnes is one speciall kind of satisfaction, as S.* Ambrose *testifieth,*
Lib. 2. de penit. cap. 5. *saying*, That he who doth penance, must with teares wash away his sinnes. *The other place cited of S.* Ambrose, De bono mortis, let vs adore Christ, that he may say vnto vs, feare not thy sinnes, nor the waues of worldly sufferings, I haue remission of sinnes, *is rather for vs then against vs: for if by adoring and serving of God we may bee put out of feare of our sins and the punishment of them, then doth it follow, that prayers and such like seruice of Christ, doth acquit vs of sinne, and satisfie for the paine due to them.*

In Psalm. 31. Hierome *saith.* The sinne that is couered, is not seen; not being seene, it is not imputed; not being imputed, it is not punished.

Answ. *To wit, with hell fire: which is the due punishment of such mortall sin whereof he speaketh: or sin may be said to bee couered, when not onely the fault is pardoned, but all punishment also due vnto it is fully payd.*

Lib. 2. de penit. cap. 5. *So doth S.* Ambrose *take that word couered saying*, The Prophet calleth both them blessed, as well him whose iniquities is forgiuen in Baptisme, as him whose sinnes are couered with good workes. For he that doth penance, must not onely wash away his sins with teares, but also with better works couer his former sins, that they be not imputed vnto him.

Hom 44. sup. Matth. *Now we must backe againe vnto* Chrysostome, *belike he had forgotten this when he cited the other, or else this was reserued to strike it dead. He saith*, Some men endure punishment in this life and in the

the life to come: others in this life alone: others alone in the life to come: other neither in this nor in the life to come: there alone as *Dives*, here alone as the incestuous Corinthian: neither here nor there, as the Apostles and Prophets, as also *Iob* and the rest of this kind, for they endured no sufferings for punishment, but that they might be knowne to be conquerers of the fight.

Answer. *Such excellent holy personages sufferings as are mentioned in the Scriptures, were not for their sins; for they committed but ordinary light offences, for which their ordinary devotions satisfied abundantly. The great persecutions which they endured, were first to manifest the vertue and power of God, that made such fraile creatures so inuincible: then to daunt the aduersaries of his truth, and withall to animate and encourage his followers. Finally, that they like conquerers, triumphing ouer all the torments of this life, might enter into possession of a greater reward in the Kingdome of heauen. All this is good doctrine, but nothing against satisfaction, that their surpassing sufferings were not for their owne sinnes. And thus much in answer vnto* M. Perkins *arguments against satisfaction.*

R. ABBOT.

Against his answer to the words of *Tertullian*, I must vrge his owne words in the section before alledged, *Doth not a pardon take away from the fault pardoned all bond of punishment due vnto it, and consequently all guiltinesse belonging to it? Who can denie this, vnlesse hee know not or care not what he say?* Now then put these together. *Tertullian* saith, [a]*The guilt being taken away, the punishment is also taken away.* But the pardoning of a sinne saith *M. Bishop*, taketh away *all guiltinesse belonging to it.* Therefore consequently it taketh away all the punishment: for where there is no guilt, no punishment can bee. Yes saith *M. Bishop*, *guiltinesse of temporall punishment doth remaine after the sinne and guilt of eternall bee released.* But then a pardon doth not take away *all the guiltinesse* of sinne, as before he saith it doth. *Oportet mendacem esse memorem: A lyer must bear a braine.* Againe, wee would know some ground whereupon we may be assured that sinne hath two kinds of guilt; for wee conceiue but one onely guilt whereby

[a] *Tertul. de baptismo. Exempto reatu eximitur & pœna.*

the ſinner is guilty of all, both temporall and eternal puniſhments. Otherwiſe wee may with as good warrant affirme guilt of infinite ſorts; one whereby a man is guilty of burning, another whereby he is guilty of drowning, another for the gowt, another for the palſie, and for euery ſeuerall puniſhment a ſeuerall guilt; & that there may be a remitting of one of theſe guilts, & yet a retaining of the other. If *M. Biſhop* take this to be abſurd, he muſt giue vs leaue to take him for an abſurd man in thus ſeuering the guilt of temporall and eternall puniſhments. Yea and this aſſertiō of his is the denying of that that in the ground of this queſtion is ſuppoſed and confeſſed. For if the ſinne be *paſt and pardoned*, as he ſaith at firſt, how remaineth there any *guilt*? for what is the pardoning of a ſinne but the remitting of the guilt? The guilt is a bond, whereby wee ſtand bound to puniſhment; the forgiuing of the ſinne, what is it but the releaſing or looſing of this bond? If the bond be releaſed, why doth he affirm that we are bound ſtill? or if we be ſtill bound, why doth he affirme the looſing of the bond? If he will ſay that the bond is partly releaſed, and partly ſtandeth ſtill, then let him ſay, the ſinne in part is pardoned, but not wholy, and then let him ſhew vs what warrant he hath, that God in that ſort forgiueth ſins by patches and peeces, which becauſe hee cannot do, let him giue vs leaue to take him for that that he ſheweth himſelfe to be.

The words of *Auſtin* are meerely deluded with the ſame ſhift. b *Chriſt* (ſaith he) *by taking vpon him the puniſhment, and not taking vpon him the fault, hath done away both the fault and the puniſhment. Iuſt*, ſaith *M. Biſhop, the eternall puniſhment, not the temporall.* But how doth hee warrant this limitation in one part of the ſentence which cannot be iuſtified in the other? Where it is ſaid that Chriſt *hath taken vpon him the puniſhment*; it is vnderſtood of our puniſhment both temporall and eternall, though that which ſhould haue bene eternall to vs, by the infinit power of his Godhead was ouercome and made temporall to him. Was it S. *Auſtins* meaning then to ſay, that Chriſt hauing taken vpon him our whole puniſhment, hath deliuered vs only from a part, and left the reſt to be ſatisfied by our ſelues? Surely what Chriſt tooke vpon him for vs, from the ſame he deliuered vs. He tooke vpon him our temporall puniſhments: therefore hee hath taken away our temporall puniſhments, ſo that they remaine not in the nature of puniſhments but

b *Aug. de verb. Dom ſer. 37. Suſcipiendo pœnam & non ſuſcipiendo culpam et culpam deluit & pœnam.*

but of medicines, to them that haue obtained forgiueneſſe of ſinnes by faith in him. That the mediation of Chriſt extendeth to the remitting of temporall puniſhments, I haue ſhewed * before, and therfor need not ſtand here any longer to confute this improbable and vnlikely gloſe. As for the place of *Auſtine* which he alledgeth for colouring hereof, it hath his anſwer in the former ſection, being the next words to thoſe that are cited there. [d] *God hath giuen to no man a freedome to ſinne, albeit the ſinnes that are already committed he in mercie bloteth out, if conuenient ſatisfaction be not neglected.* Here is *ſatisfaction* firſt, and thereupon the *blotting out of ſinne*, but *M. Biſhop* telleth vs of the blotting out of ſinne firſt, and of a ſatisfaction required after. Why doth he wilfully abuſe his Reader, to make ſhew of prouing that to which he alledgeth nothing? The thing that he ſhould proue is, that God remitting the ſinne and the eternall puniſhment, doth reſerue the making of a temporall ſatisfaction, and he bringeth in *Auſtine* requiring conuenient ſatisfaction for the remitting of the ſinne. His argument then if we will frame it, muſt be this; We muſt vſe conuenient ſatisfaction vnto God for the obtaining of the forgiueneſſe of our ſinnes. Therefore after that our ſinnes be forgiuen vs, we are ſtill to make a temporall ſatisfaction vnto God; which if it be not a good one, we may take him to be ſtarke naught. Of the name of ſatisfaction I ſhall ſpeake further in the laſt ſection; here it is enough briefly to obſerue, that the *conuenient ſatisfaction* ſpoken of by Saint *Auſtine*, is no conuenient argument for Popiſh ſatisfaction. The other place cited from him, is a flat deniall of ſatisfaction after this life, * *When we are gone out of this world, there will not remaine any compunction or ſatisfaction.* *M. Biſhop* ſaith, that there remaineth ſatisfaction though there remaine no compunction; but *S. Auſtine* ſaith, there remaineth neither compunction nor ſatisfaction. But although *M. Biſhops* whole drift tend to that that I haue ſayd, yet I wiſh thee gentle Reader, to obſerue here how pretily he circumuenteth himſelfe. *After this life* (ſaith he) *there is no place left to compunction, that is, contrition of heart, neither conſequently to confeſſion of ſatisfaction.* If becauſe there is no place for compunction in this life, therfore there be no ſatisfaction after this life, why doth he tell vs in the beginning that after this life there is *ſatisfactiõ to be made in purgatory if we die before we haue fully ſatisfied here?*

[c] *Sect. 2. & 3.*

[d] *Auguſt. Enchirid. cap. 70. Nemini dedit laxamentum peccandi quamuis miſerando doleat iam facta peccata, ſi non ſatisfactio congrua negligatur.*

[e] *Homil. 5. Cùm de hoc ſeculo tranſierimus, nulla compunctio vel ſatisfactio remanebit.* Some read, *vel aliqua ſatisfactio*, which muſt be reſolued thus, *Non vlla compunctio vel ſatisfactio aliqua remanebit*, or elſe the diuiſion leaueth place to compunction and repentance after this life, which opinion *Auſtine* there inueieth againſt, and M. *Biſhop* himſelfe heere diſclaimeth.

why do they make men beleeue, that for the dead satisfaction may be made by them that are aliue? There is satisfaction, he saith, after this life, and he saith there is no satisfaction after this life, and thus indeed knoweth not what to say. But yet he telleth vs, that *S. Austine* thereby acknowledgeth that *before we go out of this world, there is place both for compunction & satisfaction, & so that place* (saith he) *is rather for vs.* Wel, but what he gaineth in the scabberd, he loseth double in the dagger. If Purgatory sink into hell, they are in a woefull case. It is Purgatory satisfaction specially that they haue their liuing by. Now against Purgatory satisfaction he giueth vs this argument: where there is no place for compunction, there is no place for satisfaction. But in purgatory there is no place for compunction. Therefore there is no place now left for Purgatory satisfaction. As for satisfaction in this life, in such sort as *S. Austin* speaketh of it, we denie it not. Satisfaction is nothing else with him but true repentance, as shall be shewed hereafter; and we preach repentance, not according to the illusiõs of Popery, but according to the truth of the word of God.

The next words are cited out of *Chrysostome*, for which is noted *Procem. in Esaiam.* Others citing the same work, do set downe what they cite, as *ex Hypomnemate in Esaiam.* But the words are by my copy in his third homily *de pœnitentia*, and they do indeed irrefragably ouerthrow *M. Bishops* satisfactions. [f] *Say not vnto me, I haue sinned: how shall I be freed from so many sinnes? Thou canst not, but thy God can: yea and he will so blot out thy sinnes, that there shall remaine no print of them. Which thing befals not the body, for when it is healed, there remaines a scarre, but God so blotteth out sinnes, as that there remaineth no scarre nor token of scarre, no print or signe at all, but after a deliuerance from punishment he giueth thee iustice, and maketh the sinner equall to him that hath not sinned, for he extinguisheth sinne & maketh it not to be, yea as if it had neuer bene.* Which words are apparently spoken of actuall sinnes, [g] *The act whereof is past*, as *S. Austine* saith, *with the time wherein they are done, but the guilt remaineth, till by pardon it be remitted.* Now God so remitteth it, saith *Chrysostom*, as that *no print thereof remaineth.* If *no print thereof remaine*, if it be *as if it had neuer bene*, how doth *M. Bishop* then tell vs, that after forgiuenesse there remaineth still a guilt of temporall punishment? This is the point; why did he not answer to it? why doth he turne his

f *Chrysost. de pœnit. hom. 3. Neque mihi dixeris, permultum peccaui, quomodo saluari possum? Tu nequam, sed Dominus tuus potest, atque ita potest, vt tua deleat peccata. Sic enim delet peccata Deus, vt neque eorum vestigium maneat. In corporibus quidem id non est ita, sed quamquam millies conetur medicus cicatrix remanet: Deus autem sic delet vt neque cicatrix neque cicatricis superstet indicium, non vestigium quodlibet, sed post pœnæ liberationem & iustitiam vt inserit, & peccatum æquale facit non peccanti. Extinguit enim peccatum atque id non esse facit nec fuisse.*

g *Aug: de nupt. & concup. lib. 1. cap. 26. Eorum peccatorum quæ manere non possunt, quoniam cum fiunt præterent, reatus tamen manet, &c. Reus est donec reatus ipsius indulgentia remittatur.*

his ſpeech from actual ſinnes whereof the place is meant, to originall ſinne whereof it cannot be meant? becauſe though he tell vs that originall ſinne remaineth not, yet he cannot denie but that ſome ſcarre or ſigne thereof remaineth in the concupiſcence of the fleſh. But *Chryſoſtome* denieth the remaining of any ſcar or ſigne, which can no otherwiſe be true but onely in actuall ſinnes wherof nothing but the guilt remaineth, and which by remiſſion is perfectly done away. But that originall ſinne, though the guilt be remitted, yet as touching the corruption continueth ſtill, hath bene ſufficientle ſhewed before in the handling of that queſtion.

As touching the place of *Ambroſe*, I will not gainſay that which *M. Biſhop* anſwereth. *Ambroſe* ſaith as *M. Perkins* alledgeth, [h] *I reade of Peters tears, but his ſatisfaction I reade not*: but *ſatisfaction* is not there taken in that meaning whereof we ſpeake. He meaneth indeed that he vſeth no apology, no excuſe or anſwer for himſelfe, but yeelded himſelfe with teares to the acknowledgment of that that he hath done amiſſe. The word of *ſatisfactiõ* is here very vnproperly vſed, and therefore may very eaſily be miſtaken, without any purpoſe of coſinage or fraud. I might as well obiect coſinage here to *M. Biſhop*, who taking vpon him to make good his anſwer by another place of *Ambroſe*, alledgeth for another place the very ſame which *M. Perkins* cited. But *Ambroſe* hath the words indeed in another place in one of his [i] ſermons, and therefore we will not charge *M. Biſhop* here with coſinage, there being other wiſe euery while occaſions enow to diſcouer him to be a coſiner. As for that which he ſaith, that *Peter ſought by tears and bitter weeping to ſatiſfie in part for his fault*, we take him to deale very abſurdly in that he ſhould go about to make the Apoſtle ſo abſurd, as to thinke the ſhedding of a few teares to be any part of the redemption of ſo great a ſinne. The Apoſtles teares were no part of Popiſh ſatisfaction, but the tokens of true repentance, lamenting the wound, but ſeeking the cure onely in the ſatisfaction of the croſſe of Chriſt. As for that which he alledgeth from *Ambroſe*. that [k] *he that repenteth muſt with his teares waſh away his ſin*: he needed not for that phraſe to haue gone ſo far, he might haue found it in the places [l] before alledged. But he ſpake therein as we many times do, not as thinking the teares of the bodie to be the waſhing away of the ſinnes of the ſoule, but as to note that the weeping and teares of faith

[h] *Ambroſ. in Luc. lib. 10. cap. 22. Lachrymas eius lego, ſatisfactionem non lego.*

[i] *Ser. 46. Lachrymas eius lego, ſatisfactionem non lego. Rectè plane Petrus flenſ: & tacuit, quia quod deſleri ſolet, non ſolet excuſari.*

[k] *De pœnit. lib. 2. cap. 5. Qui pœnitentiam agit, non ſolum debuere lachrymis debet peccatum ſuum, ſed etiam, &c.*

[l] *In Luc. lib. 10. cap. 22. Lauant lachryme delictum quod vocē pudor eſt confiteri: & idem habet ſer. 46.*

do obtaine of God the waſhing away of our ſinnes in the bloud of Jeſus Chriſt. In the other place *S. Ambroſe* ſaith thus: [m] *Let vs ſeeke Chriſt in our laſt times, let vs embrace his feete, and worſhip him, that he may ſay vnto vs, Feare not: that is, feare not for the ſins & iniquities of the world; feare not for the waues of bodily ſufferings, I am the forgiueneſſe of ſinnes.* So long as there is neceſſity of puniſhment, eſpecially ſuch a [n] helliſh puniſhment as they ſay is in Purgatory, ſo long there is iuſt cauſe of feare. But *S. Ambroſe* telleth vs heere, that Chriſt by forgiueneſſe of ſinnes taketh away all occaſion of feare; that in our ſinnes and iniquities hee leaueth vs nothing to be afraid of. It followeth therefore, that after forgiueneſſe of ſinnes there is no further puniſhment, no further ſatisfaction to be made. Heere *M. Biſhop* againe putteth off his Reader with a dodge: If (ſaith he) *by adoring and ſerning of God wee may bee put out of feare of our ſinnes and the puniſhment of them, then do it follow that praiers and ſuch like ſeruice of Chriſt doth acquite vs of ſin, and ſatisfie for the paine due to them.* Which is as leaden an anſwer as if a man ſhould ſay, If by intreating & praying the Phyſicion I obtaine of him a medicine whereby I am cured, then my intreating and praying is the very medicine it ſelfe by which I am cured. For what do we ſeeke Chriſt, worſhip him, embrace him, deſire him, pray vnto him, but to be releeued, ſuccoured, comforted and ſaued by him, that in him we may haue ſatisfaction and remiſſion of our ſinnes? What madneſſe is it then to make our ſeeking, our worſhipping, our praying, to be themſelues the ſatisfaction that we profeſſe to ſeeke in him? But ſuch madneſſe doe they runne into, who will not ſubmit their right mindes to the obedience of the faith of Chriſt. In the next place followeth *Hierome.* [o] *That which is couered, is not ſeene; that which is not ſeene, is not imputed; that which is not imputed is not puniſhed.* He ſpeaketh it for expoſition of the words of *Dauid,* [p] *Bleſſed is the man whoſe vnrighteouſneſſe is forgiuen, and whoſe ſinne is couered; bleſſed is he to whom the Lord imputeth no ſinne.* Now if the forgiuing of ſinne be not the imputing of ſinne, then where ſinne is forgiuen, there is no puniſhment, becauſe there is no imputation of that to which the puniſhment is due. *That which is not imputed, is not puniſhed. To wit,* ſaith *M. Biſhop, with hell fire.* But that anſwer will not ſerue his turne: for if it be any way puniſhed, it cannot be ſaid not to be imputed: for whence ariſeth the puniſhment but

m *De bono mortis. cap. 12. Nos eum in temporum fine quæramus, et complectamur pedes eius, & adoremus eum, vt dicat & nobis, Nolite timere, id eſt, nolite timere à peccatis ſeculi, nolite timere ab iniquitatibus mundi, nolite timere á fluctibus corporalium paſſionum; ego ſum peccatorum remiſſio.*

n *Bellar. de pœnit. lib. 4. cap. 1. Pœna illa quæ luenda reſtat poſt culpæ remiſſionem eſt illa ipſa pœna ſenſus quam in gehenna pati debuiſſet peccator, remota ſolùm æternitate.*

o *Hieron. in Pſal. 31. Quod tegitur non videtur: quod non videtur, non imputatur: quod non imputatur nec punietur.*

p *Pſal. 32. 1.*

but from the imputation of the ſinne? Now of *not imputing S. Auſtine* telleth vs, that [q] *when ſinne is not imputed, a man is taken as if he had neuer done it.* So ſaith *S. Bernard*, that [r] *what ſoeuer God hath determined not to impute, it is as if it had neuer bene.* If it be as if it had neuer bene, if a man be taken as if he had neuer done it, how then doth *M. Biſhop* tell vs, that there is ſtill a ſatisfaction and puniſhment to be endured for it? But therefore he bringeth vs another anſwer, ſuch as for which he deſerueth to be admired for a wiſe & well learned man. *Sinne may be ſaid to be couered when not onely the fault is pardoned, but alſo all puniſhment due vnto it is fully payed.* So then whereas in briefe *Hierome* ſaith, *The ſinne that is couered, is not puniſhed*: his meaning muſt be, that it is not couered till it be fully puniſhed: nay he is made directly to contradict himſelfe, & to ſay, *The ſinne that is puniſhed, is not puniſhed.* Would not a man thinke him to be out of his right wits that maketh ſuch wrong conſtructions of plaine words? As for the words of *Ambroſe* which he bringeth in, what is there in them concerning puniſhment after the pardon of the fault? He ſpeaketh of *couering former ſinnes with better workes*, but of couering them with puniſhment he ſaith nothing. And as for that which he ſaith, though at large it may be conſtrued well enough, yet according to the exact truth of Scripture it is vntrue, namely that *ſinnes are* vnderſtood there *to be couered with good workes*, as is plaine by that the Apoſtle witneſſeth, that the Prophet in that place deſcribeth [t] *the bleſſednes of the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteouſneſſe without workes.* But the true *couering of ſinne* is that which *S. Bernard* ſpeaketh of, when in one place he ſaith that [u] *the loue of the Father*, and in another place that [x] *the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt couereth the multitude of our ſins.* And of thoſe words of *Dauid*, it ſhall be worth the while to heare what Saint *Auſtine* ſaith, and to conſider how well *M. Biſhops* anſwer accordeth therewith. [y] *Becauſe all is imputed to grace* (ſaith he) *and not to our merit, bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiuen and whoſe ſinnes are couered. Not in whome no ſins are found, but whoſe ſinnes are couered. They are couered, they are hidden, they are aboliſhed. If God haue couered ſinnes, hee looketh not on them; if he looke not on them, he mindeth them not; if he mind them not, he will not puniſh them: he will take no knowledge of them, he chuſeth rather to forgiue them.* If forgiueneſſe of ſinnes be ſuch, as that God thenceforth

[q] *Aug. in Pſal. 118 So quia à deuiante committitur propter viam non imputatur, & tanquam non fuerit operatus accipitur.*

[r] *Bern. in Cant. ſer. 23. Omne quod mihi ipſe non imputare decreuerit, ſic eſt quaſi non fuerit.*

[t] Rom. 4. 6, 7.

[u] *Bernar. in Cant. ſer. 23. Charitas patrum ipſorum coperit multitudinem peccatorum.*

[x] *Ibid. ſerm. 61. Iuſtitia tua in me operit multitudinem peccatorum.*

[y] *Aug. in Pſal. 31. Quia totum gratiæ imputatur non meritis noſtris beati quorum &c. Non in quibus non ſunt inuenta peccata ſed quorum tecta ſunt peccata. Cooperta ſunt, tecta ſunt: abolita ſunt. Si texit peccata Deus, noluit aduertere; ſi noluit aduertere, noluit ea animaduertere; ſi noluit animaduertere, noluit punire: noluit agnoſcere, maluit ignoſcere.*

foorth loketh not on them, mindeth them not, taketh no knowledge of them, puniſheth them not, let vs know that that which *M. Biſhop* ſaith is an vntruth, that hee ſtill reſerueth ſharp & ſeuere puniſhment both in this life and in the life to come to bee inflicted for them.

The force of the ſaying of *Chryſoſtome* which is the laſt, ſtandeth in this, that he denieth that *the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and holy men endured their ſufferings for puniſhments, but that they might be known to be conquerers in the fight.* The place ſheweth that the afflictions of the righteous and faithfull haue not the nature of puniſhments, but lie vpon them for other reſpects, & therefore not being in the nature of puniſhments, they cannot be accounted for ſatisfactions. *M. Biſhop* anſwereth, that *they were no puniſhments for their owne ſinnes.* And why? *for they* (ſaith he) *committed but ordinary light offences, for which their ordinary deuotions ſatisfied abundantly.* A very dapper, but a verie fond ſpeech of a remorſleſſe man, whoſe heart yet hath neuer felt what the burden of ſinne is. Good Lord, how lightly doth he trip ouer with *ordinary light offences*! Surely the redeeming of thoſe light offences required the ſhedding of the bloud of the Sonne of God; & is it ſo lightly to be skipped ouer, for which the Sonne of God ſhed his moſt precious bloud? Tuſh, ſaith *M. Biſhop, their ordinary deuotiõs did abundantly ſatisfie for their ſins.* Belike they were proud hearted as he is: they would not be beholding to God, they would not die in his debt; what they owed him they would pay themſelues for themſelues, being rich enough, and well able to diſcharge all. But will he make thoſe holy men as very fooles as himſelfe, that they neither knew God or themſelues, but would thinke their ordinarie deuotions to be ſufficient ſatisfaction for their ſins? No, no, they knew well that after all their deuotions they ſtood in need of Gods mercy, that they had ſtill to cry, *Forgiue* vs our debts, *Enter not into iudgement* with vs: that all their merites were but droſſe, and all their ſatisfactions were but dung if they were oppoſed againſt the iudgment of God, as to ſhield them from their ſins. But *M. Biſhop* yet addeth more: *It is nothing againſt ſatisfactions, that their ſurpaſſing ſufferings were not for their own ſins.* And why? becauſe we muſt vnderſtand forſooth, that though they were not ſatisfactions for their owne ſinnes, yet they were ſo for other mens, and in that reſpect are called *ſurpaſſing*, as namely exceeding

ceeding the measure of their owne sins. This is that impious monster of Romish apostasie, whereby they have put the *Saints* in Christs place, and taught men to seek for that redemption in them which they shou'd seeke for and find in him alone. But we would gladly know of *M. Bishop*, where those *surpassing sufferings* of *Iob* and of the Prophets and other holy Saints of old were layd, before the storehouse was built at Rome? what vse were they put to? who was the dispencer and disposer of them? What, was there a Pope then also to send pardons flying about the world to fetch one soule out of Purgatory for the *surpassing sufferings* of another? Or shal we think that they lay idle al that while, that the whole harueſt of thē towards the end of the world might be brought together into the Popes barnes? The high Priest of the Iewes was ouerseene, that he did not take vpon him to be Pope of Jerusalem, for of these *surpassing sufferings* he might haue raised much thrift. Wicked caitiues, that thus delude men with blasphemous tales and lies, who thus defile the innocent bloud of the *Sonne* of God, by mingling with it the leprous and corrupted bloud of sinfull men. They all thought wholly and onely to be redeemed by Christ, and must we thinke now in part to be redeemed by them? They knew themselues by their sinnes guiltie of eternall suffering, and must we now thinke their sufferings to be beyond their sinne? But against this blasphemie, sufficient hath bene said before; albeit it is in it selfe so grosly impious and loathsome, as that the very mention of it is enough to make all Christian hearts to detest them that are the teachers of it.

## 8. W. Bishop.

*Now to the reasons which he produceth for it. And albeit he like an euill master of the camp, range our arguments out of order, placing that in the forefront of our side, which* Caluin *presseth out against vs, yet wil I admit of it, rather then brake his order.* Lib. 3. *Instit. cap.* 4. *num.* 29.

1. Moses according to Gods commandement prescribed seuerall sacrifices for the sins of seuerall persons, and ordained that they should be of greater and lesser prices, according vnto the diuersitie of the sinnes. *Whence we argue thus: These mens faults vpon their true repentance, ioyned with faith and hope in Christ to come, were pardoned: Therefore their charges in buying of sacrifices to be offered for them-* Leuit. 5. 6.

*their*

*[a]heir paines and prayers in assisting, during the time of the sacrifice, being painful works done to appease Gods iustice, were works of satisfactiō.*

M. Perkins *answereth many things, as men do commonly when they cannot well tell what they say directly to the purpose: First, that those sacrifices were types of Christs suffering on the crosse: what is this to the purpose? Secondly, that those sacrifices were satisfactions to the congregation: and what needed that, when they had offended God onely, and not the congregation, as in many offences it happeneth? Againe, if satisfaction must be giuen to the congregation, how much more reason is it that it be made to God? Reade those Chapters, and you shall finde that they were principally made to obtaine remission of God, as these words* Leuit. 4. ver. 20. *also do witnesse*: And vpon that sacrifice, the sinne shall be forgiuen them. *So that sacrifices were to satisfie God, who thereupon forgaue the sinne, and all paine due to it.*

## R. Abbot.

*M. Bishop* belike had no great conceit of this argument of theirs, and therefore was angry that *M. Perkins* should disgrace them by putting it in the first place. Ilfauouredly it is propounded, and ilfauouredly maintained, but yet such learning it is, as he with great paines hath brought from Rome. The foundation that he layeth is a lie, and the building that he setteth vpon it, a ridiculous consequence. He telleth vs, that *Moses* prescribing by the commaundement of God seuerall sacrifices for seuerall persons, *did ordaine that they should be of greater & lesser prices, according to the diuersity of the sinnes.* But where is that ordinance? why doth he not exemplifie that which he saith? where do we finde in *Moses* law, that for such or such a sinne, greater or lesse, shall be offered a sacrifice of such or such greater or lesser price? Surely he is little acquainted himselfe in *Moses* law, and some Register or other gaue him a gudgeon at Rome, and made him beleeue that the Popes *Taxa pœnitentiaria*, whereby euery sinne is rated at a certaine price, was framed according to the same law of *Moses*, and according to the prices of the sacrifices prescribed therein. We reade there indeed of diuers sacrifices, as in sinnes of ignorance [a] *for the Priest a yong bullocke*, [b] *for the whole congregation the same*; [c] *for a ruler a he goate*; *for any of* [d] *the people a she goate*; [e] *for any consecrate thing by errour withholden*

a Leuit. 4. 3.
b Vers. 14.
c Ver. 22. 23.
d Vers. 28.
e Chap. 5. 15.

*a ramme of two shekels*; [f] for other trespasse against holy things ignorantly done, *the same*; for [g] sinne wittingly committed, the same also; for the high [h] Priests yearly offering for himself and his house, *a bullocke and a ramme*; and for the whole people [i] *two hee goats and a ramme*. This diuersitie we reade, and some few other such like, but of sacrifices of greater or lesser price, according to the diuersity of the sinnes, we reade nothing, it is a thing that *Moses and Aaron* neuer knew. Well, let that go, let vs see what argument hee hath framed against vs. *These mens faults* (saith he) *vpon their true repentance, ioyned with faith and hope in Christ, were pardoned. Therefore their charges in buying of sacrifices, their pains and prayers in assisting during the time of the sacrifice, being painefull workes, done to appease Gods iustice, were workes of satisfaction.* O what paines heere was for the appeasing of Gods iustice, to stand by and pray whilest the sacrifice was offering! Such cruell paines doth *M. Bishop* impose vpon his penitents for their sweet sins, that a man may sweare they are the worse for it all their life after. Vaine man, was this a paines to be spoken of, for the satisfying and appeasing of the iustice of God for sinne? But to let this passe, if [k] *the honest man*, of whom *M. Bishop* hath spoken before, should out with a little Latin, and tell him here, *M. Doctor, negatur argumentum*, how foully wold he be grauelled, and so set at a *Nonplus*, that he could not tell which way to turne him? What, because they that offered the sacrifice with true repentance in the faith of Christ were pardoned, doth it therefore follow that their charges and their paines were the satisfactiō for their sins? The *honest man* would tell him, good sir, you erre by assigning a wrong cause; for it was not for his charges and his paines that he was pardoned, but for his faith in Christ. He laid not his hand vpon himselfe, as to lay his sinne vpon himselfe, but [l] *he layd it vpon the head of the dumb beast*, as in figure of Iesus Christ, [m] *vpon whom the Lord would lay the iniquities of vs all*. Therefore his sacrifice, if hee offered it aright, was only a profession of the hope of redemption by Christ, & he was therby instructed in him alone to expect full satisfaction and forgiuenesse of his sinnes. Now thus in effect *M. Perkins* answered him, and hee reciting the answer by halues, asketh, *What it this to the purpose?* Very much it is against his purpose, if in the sacrifices themselues there were nothing else but a direction to seeke satisfaction in Iesus Christ. [n] *The Law had*

f Ver. 18.
g Chap. 6.6.
h Chap. 16.3.
i Ver. 5.
k Of the certainty of saluation, sect. 2.
l Leuit. 1.4.
m Esa. 53.6.
n Heb. 10.1.

*the*

*the ſhadow of good things to come, and not the (liuely or ſubſtantiall) image of the things themſelues.* Therfore no ſatisfaction indeed, but onely a ſhadow of ſatisfaction to come was to bee found therein.

o Ver. 4. For o *it was vnpoſſible that the bloud of buls and goats ſhould take away ſin.* And therfore the Law *was* p *aboliſhed for the weakneſſe and vnprofitableneſſe of it.* How ſhould it be ſaid to be *weake*, or why ſhould it be called *vnprofitable*, if *ſatisfaction* for ſins were to be found in it?

p Chap. 7. 18.

Albeit in ſome meaning *M. Perkins* acknowledgeth in them *a ſatisfaction*, not to God, but to the Church of God, as teſtimonies of their repentance, and of their deſire to bee reconciled to God and men. *What needed that*, ſaith *M. Biſhop, when they had offended God onely, and not the congregation, as in many offences it happeneth?* I anſwer him, that becauſe all men are ſinners, euery man was by theſe ſacrifices to giue acknowledgment thereof as touching himſelfe, and to ſhew his care to be reconciled to God, either for publike or priuate offences, whereby hee had with *Achan* prouoked Gods wrath againſt his people as well as againſt himſelfe. Vpon the doing whereof, men were accounted to the Church and with men, as ſanctified and cleanſed from their ſinnes, and no exception was to be taken againſt their ioyning themſelues to the Church. And therefore for warrant of this diſtinction the Scripture teacheth, that thoſe ſacrifices did q *ſanctifie as touching the purifying of the fleſh*, that is, outwardly to men, but r *to ſanctifie the conſcience*, to acquit the conſcience of ſinnes, it reſerueth as a thing peculiar to the bloud of Chriſt. But, ſaith *M. Biſhop*, *if ſatisfaction muſt bee giuen to the congregation, how much more reaſon is it that it bee made to God?* True, but what are we ſinfull wretches, that we ſhould think that any thing that we can doe ſhould bee a ſatisfaction to him for ſinne? But much more abſurd are we to think, that the offering of a bruit creature ſhould bee any part of the redemption thereof. Our ſatisfaction therefore is not any thing that wee do or can doe, but it is onely the pleading of a ſatisfaction payed for vs in the bloud of Chriſt. Yet he ſtill vrgeth, that *ſacrifices were to ſatisfie God, becauſe it is ſaid, that vpon the ſacrifice the ſinne ſhall bee forgiuen.* But I haue already anſwered him, that it was forgiuen not for the ſacrifice ſake, but for Chriſts ſake, whom the offerer was to vnderſtand therein. And we know, that of Sacraments vſually thoſe effects are ſpoken which properly belong to thoſe things

q Heb. 9. 13.
r Ver 9. 14. & Chap. 10 1. 2.

whereof

whereof they are ſacraments. It is rightly ſaid by *Tertullian*, that *God* in theſe ſacrifices [f] *required not the things which were done, but that for which they were done.* And therefore as *Origen* ſaith, as touching the high Prieſts ſtanding forth to appeaſe the wrath of God, when the Angell was gone forth to bee the executioner thereof, [t] *The deſtroying Angell would not haue baſhed at the high Prieſts garments made of purple, and wool, and ſilke, but he vnderſtood thoſe garments that ſhould bee of the great high Preieſt (Ieſus Chriſt) and to them he yeelded:* euen ſo we are to conceiue that the wrath of God was no whit nor in any ſort pacified by thoſe ſacrifices for the things themſelues that were done therein, but hee reſpected in them the bloud and ſacrifice of his onely begotten Sonne, and therto was content to yeeld himſelfe ſatisfied & appeaſed towards them that offered with faith in him.

[f] *Tertul contra Marc. lib. 3. Non quæ fiebant exigens ſed propter quod fiebant.*

[t] *Origē. in Num. hom. 9. Neque enim indumenta Pontificis purpura & lana & byſſo contexta eruluiſſet Angelus ille vaſtator, ſed iſta quæ futura erant indumenta magni Pontificis intellexit & ijs ceſſit.*

## 9 W. BISHOP.

*The reaſon for vs (which indeed is the very groundwork of ſatisfaction) may thus be framed: many after pardon obtained of their ſins, haue had temporall puniſhment layed vpon them for the ſame ſinnes, and that by Gods owne order: wherefore after the forgiueneſſe of the ſin, and the eternall puniſhment of it through Chriſts ſatisfaction, there remaineth ſome temporall paine, to be endured by the party himſelfe for the ſame ſin, which is moſt properly that which we call ſatisfaction. They denie that any man hath beene puniſhed temporally for any ſin which was once pardoned: wee proue it firſt by the example of the Iſraelites, whoſe murmuration againſt God, was at* Moſes *interceſſion pardoned; yet all the elder ſort of them, who had ſeen the miracles wrought in Ægypt for their deliuerance, were by the ſentence of God depriued of the ſight of the land of promiſe, and puniſhed with death in the wilderneſſe for the very ſame their murmuration. The like iudgement was giuen againſt* Moſes *himſelfe and* Aron, *for not glorifying God at the waters of contradiction: both of them had their ſin pardoned, yet were they both afterward for the ſame debarred from the entrance into the holy land.* Numb. 14. Numb. 20. Deut. 32.

*To this* M Perkins *anſwereth, firſt, that a man muſt bee conſidered in a two fold eſtate, as he is vnder the Law, and as hee is vnder grace. In the former eſtate all afflictions were curſes of the Law: in the latter,*

*they*

*they are turned vnto thē that beleeue in Christ, from curses into trials, corrections, preuentions, admonitions, instructions, and into what you wil else ſauing ſatisfaction. Now to the purpoſe. Whereas God (ſaith hee) denied the beleeuing Iſralites, with* Moſes *and* Aaron, *to enter into the land of Canaan, it cannot be proued that it was a puniſhment or penaltie of the law laid vpon them: the Scripture hath no more but that it was an admonition vnto all ages following, to take heede of like offences, as* Paul *writeth,* All theſe things came vnto them for examples, and were written for our admonition.

2. Cor. 10.

Reply. *He that will not be aſhamed of this audacious aſſertion, needs not to care what he ſaith. Hath the Scripture no more of their fact, then that it was an admonition to others? Turne to the original places, where the whole matter in particular is related: Firſt their murmuration then* Moſes *interceſſiō for them, and the obtaining of their pardon, & laſtly after all the reſt, Gods ſentence of depriuation of them from entring into the land of promiſe, for that their murmuratiō. Again,* Aron *ſhal not enter into the land, becauſe he hath bin diſobedient to my voice: and of* Moſes, Becauſe he hath treſpaſſed againſt me at the waters of ſtrife. *So that nothing is more cleare euen by the teſtimony of the holy Ghoſt, then that their daies were ſhortned, and their hope of entrance into the land of promiſe cut off in puniſhment of thoſe offences, which wer before forgiuen them. And theſe things being recorded, as S.* Paul *teſtifieth, for our admonition and inſtruction, we are to learne thereby, that God ſo dealeth daily with all thoſe ſinners that he calleth to repentance.*

Numb. 14.
Num. 20. Ve. 24.
Deut. 32. 51.

## R. Abbot.

*M. Biſhop* here maketh a hot and a long harueſt, and all his corne will not yeeld him ſo much as one morſell of bread. He telleth vs that the argument which he here handleth is *the very ground worke of ſatisfaction*: now if the ground work faile, we may be wel aſſured that the building cannot ſtand. We deny indeed that any affliction or iudgement of God hath lien vpon any faithful man in the nature and condition of a puniſhment after the forgiueneſſe of his ſinne. The things themſelues, which in their owne nature are puniſhments, and at the firſt are inflicted in that nature, yet the ſinne being forgiuen, loſe that nature, and become onely trials, preuentions, admonitions, inſtructions; neither do we therin conceiue Gods

Gods anger against vs, but his fatherly goodnesse, and prouidence & care to keepe vs to himselfe, that he may make vs partakers of eternall life. Thus carnall concupiscence being of it selfe a punishment of sinne, though according to the guilt it be taken away by remission of sins, yet according to the thing it selfe remaineth in the faithfull, not now for a punishment, but for the humbling and exercising of vs, to make vs to know our selues, to draw vs to trust & confidence in God, to sharpen our desire & loue of that righteousnesse for which we fight in fighting against it. So death of it self the wages of sin, becometh to the faithful as a poison broken into a medicine, and as a serpent that hath lost his sting: [a] *There is no sting but song*, saith S. *Bernard*, *man now dieth singing, and singeth dying. O thou mother of mourning*, saith he, *thou art turned to ioy; thou enemy of glory doest now serue to giue glory; thou gate of hel art vsed for an entry to the kingdom of heauen, and thou pit of destruction for the finding of saluation.* S. *Austin* saith thereof, that [b] *God inflicted death for the punishment of sin, and after forgiuenes of sins he still left it for the exercising of righteousnesse, that*, saith he, *the fortitude of righteousnesse might bee exercised in ouercoming the feare therof.* The like hath beene noted out of him [c] before concerning other iudgements laid vpon mankind in the beginning, by reason of sinne. Now as of these, so of all other afflictions after forgiuenesse of sinnes, wee resolue that they forgo their former condition and property, and cease to be reuengements and punishments for sinne, but haue other respects and vses for which they are continued. The examples so strongly vrged by *Master Bishop* make nothing against this. First, the Israelites murmure, God to *Moses* threatneth wholy to destroy thē, promising to make of him a mighty people. *Moses* prayeth vnto God to withhold that wrath from his people, & to forgiue the trespasse. God saith, [d] *I haue forgiuē it, according to thy request*: but he addeth, *Notwithstanding as I liue all the earth shal be filled with the glory of the Lord: for all those men which haue seene my glory & my miracles which I did in Egypt & in the wildernes, & haue tempted me these ten times, and haue not obeyed my voice, certainly they shall not see the land wherof I sware vnto their fathers.* Here is the forgiuenes of a sin, saith *M. Bishop*, and yet a punishment ensuing after. But wee answere him, that this example altereth the question, & cometh not within the compasse of that wherof we speake. For it is one thing to speak

a Iram.

a Bern. in Cant. Ser. 26. Iam non stimulus sed iubilus. Iam cantando moritur homo & morsendo cantat. Vsurparit ad lætissam mater marroris, vsurparit ad gloriam gloriæ inimica: vsurparit ad exitroitum regni porta inferi. & sonea perditionis ad inuentionem salutis.

b Aug. de pec. mer & remiss. li. 2. cap. 34. Mortem corporis propter peccatum homini Deus inflixit, & post peccatorum remissionem propter exercendam iustitiam non ademit. Et paulò prius: eam fidelibus euenire, vt eius timore vincēdo exerceretur forti: usu iustitiæ.

c Sect. 2.

d Num. 14. 20.